

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR

CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

JULY, 1858. . . . OCTOBER, 1858.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS

VOL. CVIII

**LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, LONGMANS, & ROBERTS, LONDON;
AND ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.**

1858.

OS 2 E D I
Vol. 108 (Pt. 1+2)

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
Stack 100 7525 Box 23,

LONDON:
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.,
NEW-STREET SQUARE.

CONTENTS OF No. 220.

	Page
ART. I.—Memoirs of the Court of England during the Regency, 1811—1820. From Original Family Documents. By the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, K.G. 2 vols. 8vo.: 1856,	299
II.—1. Report of the Trial of Madeleine Smith, before the High Court of Justiciary at Edinburgh, June 30th to July 9th, 1857. By Alexander Forbes Irvine, Advocate. Edinburgh: 1858.	
2. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Prosecutors. May, 1856,	343
III.—History of Ancient Pottery. By Samuel Birch, F.S.A. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1856,	377
IV.—1. Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps. Par M. Guizot. Vol. I. Paris: 1858.	
2. Memoirs to illustrate the History of my Time. By F. Guizot. Vol. I. London: 1858.	
3. M. de Châteaubriand, sa Vie, ses écrits, son influence littéraire et politique sur son temps (La Tribune Moderne, Première partie). Par M. Villemain. Paris: 1858.	
4. Histoire du Gouvernement Parlementaire en France. 1814—1848. Précédée d'une Introduction. Par M. Duvergier de Hauranne. Vols. I. and II. Paris: 1857,	410
V.—1. Contributions to the Physiology of Vision. Part I. On some remarkable and hitherto unobserved Phenomena of Binocular Vision. By Charles Wheatstone, F.R.S. Philos. Transact. 1838.	
2. Contributions to the Physiology of Vision. Part II. By Charles Wheatstone, F.R.S. Philos. Transact. 1852.	
3. The Stereoscope: its History, Theory, and Construction, with its Application to the Fine and Useful Arts, and to Education. By Sir David Brewster, K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S., M.R.I.A. London: 1856.	

	Page
4. Observations on Binocular Vision, By Prof. William B. Rogers. From the American Journal of Science and Arts. 1855.	
5. Essai sur les Phosphènes, ou Anneaux Lumineux de la Rétine, considérés dans leurs rapports avec la Physiologie et la Pathologie de la Vision. Par le Dr. Serre, d'Uzès. Paris: 1853.	
6. Recherches sur la Vision Binoculaire, Simple et Double, et sur les Conditions Physiologiques du Relief. Par le Dr. Serre, d'Uzès. Bruxelles: 1856.	
7. On the Phenomena and Mechanism of the Focal Adjustment of the Eye, to distinct Vision at different Distances. By Professor Allen Thomson, M.D., F.R.S.S.L. & E. Glasgow: 1857.	
8. On the Phenomena of Relief in the Image formed on the Ground Glass of the Camera Obscura. By A. Claudet, F.R.S. From the Proceedings of the Royal Society: June 18. 1857.	
9. On the Stereomonoscope: a new Instrument by which an apparently single Picture produces the Stereoscopic Illusion. By A. Claudet, F.R.S. From the Proceedings of the Royal Society: April 15. 1858,	437
VI.—The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors, from 1057 to 1773. By the Marquis of Kildare. Third Edition. Dublin: 1858.	474
VII.—Studies of Homer and the Homeric Age. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, F.R.S., M.P., &c. The University of Oxford. 3 vols. Oxford: 1858,	502
VIII.—Guy Livingstone, or Thorough. Second Edition. London: 1858,	532
IX.—1. The London Cotton Plant, a Journal of Tropical Civilisation. Published for the Proprietors by C. Mitchell. London: June, 1858	
2. Report of the Special Committee on the Revival of the African Slave-trade, made to the Southern Convention at Montgomery, Alabama, May 10th, 1858.	
3. Resolutions passed at a Public Meeting of Free Coloured Men, held at New Bedford, Massachusetts, on the 16th June, 1858,	541
X.—The Edinburgh Review and Mr. Froude's History (Fraser's Magazine, Sept. 1858),	586

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JULY, 1858.

No. CCXIX

- ART. I. — 1. *The Cruise of the Betsey, or a Summer Ramble among the Fossiliferous Deposits of the Hebrides, with Rambles of a Geologist.* By HUGH MILLER. Edinburgh: 1858.
2. *The Old Red Sandstone, or New Walks in an Old Field.* By HUGH MILLER. Ninth Edition, 1858.
3. *First Impressions of England and its People.* By HUGH MILLER. Sixth Edition, 1857.
4. *Footprints of the Creator, or the Autobiography of Stromness.* By HUGH MILLER. London: 1849.
5. *My Schools and Schoolmasters, or the Story of my Education.* By HUGH MILLER. Edinburgh: 1854.
6. *The Testimony of the Rocks, or Geology in its Bearings on the Two Theologies, Natural and Revealed.* By HUGH MILLER. Edinburgh: 1857.

NO common interest attaches to the life and labours of the remarkable man whose writings we have placed at the head of this article. Those writings have attained a very high place in the literature of his own time, and there are good grounds for believing that this place will be permanent in the literature of the English language. They belong to the History of Science, and mark an important epoch in the progress of discovery. This, no doubt, is true more or less of many works which are afterwards forgotten, and of many contributions to our knowledge which fall into the general inheritance with but little recollection of the quarter from which they came. But there are many guarantees against such being the fate of the works of

Hugh Miller. The interest of his narrative, the purity of his style, his inexhaustible faculty of happy and ingenious illustration, his high imaginative power — so essential to the completeness of high intellectual faculties, — and that light of genius which it is so difficult to define, yet so impossible to mistake, all promise to secure for the author of the 'Old Red Sandstone' the lasting admiration of his countrymen. Those who in after times desire to make themselves acquainted with the subject on which Hugh Miller specially employed his pen, are little likely to seek their information in any other form than that in which it was originally conveyed.

Hugh Miller was born in the little town of Cromarty, on the north-eastern shores of Scotland, in the second year of the present century. His father, the owner and master of vessels employed in the coasting trade, perished at sea in 1807; and his mother was left dependent in a great measure for her own support and the education of her family upon the generosity of her kindred. Her two brothers, one of whom was a carpenter and the other a harness maker, were her principal support. To the manly and simple virtues of these two uncles Hugh Miller has left, in one of the most delightful of his works, a grateful and enduring tribute. Hugh, having learned his letters and his spelling under the tuition of a worthy woman, whose establishment was of the humblest kind, passed in due course to the parish school. There he seems to have been no otherwise distinguished than as a *harum-scarum* boy, with a turn for any literature but that which belonged to school, — a reader of strange books — a teller of queer stories — a leader in expeditions among the caves and precipices of the neighbouring coast. But in the learning which all scholars of his class in Scotland look to as the principal object of ambition, viz., that which may fit them for the ministry of the Church, Miller, much to the disappointment of his uncles, made no progress whatever. Accordingly when the years of boyhood had been spent, and the necessity of self-support came upon him, he had no other resource than some manual occupation. One of his cousins was a mason; and he had observed that this employment left him, during a considerable portion of the year, long intervals of leisure. This, therefore, was the handicraft which he chose, and at seventeen years of age he began work as an apprentice. During the three years of the term of service he seems to have been exclusively employed in his native county, and chiefly in his native district. From the narrative he has left us of this portion of his life it would appear that his acquaintance with men and manners had never

even extended so far as the neighbouring town of Inverness. His working seasons were spent wherever his master could get a job — sometimes in building farm-houses, farm-steadings or lodges at the neighbouring country houses — sometimes in the coarser operations of opening quarries and building dykes. About a year after his apprenticeship had expired, work became scarce in the North, and the great building speculations of 1824-25 having begun, Miller was induced to 'try whether he could not make his way as a mechanic among the stone-cutters of Edinburgh — perhaps the most skilful in their profession in the world.'

Probably no man who was himself destined to add to the literary celebrity of Scotland had ever so singular an introduction to the society of its capital. That society then numbered amongst its members such men as Dugald Stewart, and Jeffrey, and Wilson, and the Ettrick Shepherd, and Sir Walter Scott. But none of these men had the Cromarty mason an opportunity of seeing, — even in the street. During the ten months of his residence Miller spent his time in stone-cutting for the Mansion House of Niddry — a place lying in the hollow that intervenes between Arthur's Seat and the heights which are crowned by the ruins of Craigmillar. He worked with a squad of wild, dissipated masons, associated with those rudest of the labouring classes — there peculiarly rude — who find employment around the outskirts of our large towns. He was lodged in the same room with a farm-servant and his wife, of whom he tells us that the man 'in his journey through life had picked up scarce 'an idea;' and that the woman, 'though what in Scotland is 'called a "fine body," was not more intellectual than her husband.'

Returning to his native town with impaired health, Miller spent some of the following years in the lighter work of his profession, such as the preparation of tombstones in the country churchyards of Cromarty and Ross. The support which habits of temperance and frugality enabled him to derive from these sources of employment failing him in 1828, he repaired to Inverness. There he made his first not very promising attempt to enter on the field of literature. He sent to the 'Inverness Courier' some verses of very moderate merit, which were, not unnaturally, rejected. Piqued by this result, he determined on publishing them with others in a separate form, and having employed for his purposes the printer of the 'Courier,' he became personally known to the editor, a gentleman of the name of Carruthers, to whom the high merit belongs of having early discovered the ability and encouraged the exertions of

his humbler countryman. Miller's verses were published anonymously as the productions of a 'journeyman mason.' This title implies an apology, which in some respects was not needed, and in others was perhaps not sufficient. Miller's verses testified to knowledge and accomplishments for the want of which his position in life would have accounted, and they were chiefly deficient in those qualities which may be and often are most independent of education and of culture. The truth is that poetry cannot be judged by any standard lower than her own. Her brightest flowers have sprung, at times, from uncultivated ground; and the country which has listened to such immortal song from her 'Ayrshire ploughman' cannot be called upon to accept at more than their intrinsic worth the offerings of a 'journeyman mason.' Yet Miller's failure to rise to any degree of superiority in this department of literature is another among the many proofs how subtle are the elements on which the gift of true poetry depends. We shall see how vivid his powers of imagination were, how great his command of language, and how fine his ear for its harmony in prose. He soon began to discover the direction in which he might attain success.

During the next few years in which he continued to work as a mason in his native town, the friendly editor afforded him an opportunity for occasional contributions on subjects of local interest; and these, together with his poems, soon brought him a certain celebrity in the North. They brought him, however, little else; and as about this time he had become engaged in marriage, and as the scanty earnings of his labour afforded him no very bright prospects of supporting a wife and family, he seems to have seriously contemplated emigration to America. Fortunately a new and very unexpected employment was proffered to him. It was proposed to establish in Cromarty a branch agency of one of the great banking companies which play so considerable a part in the social economy of Scotland. Connected with this agency Miller was nominated to the office of accountant, for which it was necessary that he should prepare himself by some preliminary instruction. For this purpose he repaired to the Low Country in 1834; and in the course of a few months returned to Cromarty, not only thoroughly master of the more mechanical duties of his office, but with such a knowledge of the principles of banking that he afterwards took an able and active part in the discussion of that difficult and complicated subject.

It was at this time that he published, under the advice of the late Sir T. D. Lauder, his volume on 'Scenes and Legends

‘of the North of Scotland,’ a work for which he had been long collecting the materials. The somewhat wider reputation which this volume gave him was far less important than the wider personal acquaintance to which it was the means of introduction. During the few following years in which he resided in Cromarty, his connexion with literature was extending, and his connexion with science had begun. But his labours continued to be comparatively obscure, until an event occurred which brought him into a more prominent position, and afforded him the means of speaking to the world. In 1839 the House of Lords decided on appeal against the right of the Assemblies of the Scottish Church to regulate, as they had proposed to do, the admission of ministers. Hence the controversy which for three years raged with increasing violence throughout the country, and ended in the calamitous division of 1843. Englishmen never understood that controversy, and probably never will. But it stirred the feelings and the intellect of Scotland to their very depths. Unfortunately it fell to be decided mainly by English lawyers and English statesmen, and by some who, though not without knowledge of Scotland and its law, belonged to a school of religion and of politics widely separated from the habits and traditions of their native country. Among these was Henry Brougham. Miller, like the vast majority of his class at that time, was a liberal in politics, and had sympathised in all the causes to which that eminent man had so long devoted his versatile and brilliant powers. He was pained and alarmed by the tone and arguments of the speech in which Lord Brougham supported the finding of the House of Lords. In the course of a week he wrote and despatched to a friend in Edinburgh the MS. of ‘A Letter from one of the Scotch People to Lord Brougham, &c.’ This vigorous production commanded immediate notice. The leaders of the Non-Intrusion Party were in want of a journal to espouse their cause against a press all but universally hostile: and for the establishment of such a journal no common abilities were required. The task was offered to and accepted by Miller. He became the editor, and ultimately the proprietor, of the ‘Witness Newspaper,’ which under his guidance continued to advocate with ability and success the opinions of the Free Church.

We say nothing here of his controversial writings. They were able, varied, picturesque, sometimes philosophical, but too often bitter, and not unfrequently wanting that taste and refinement in which on other subjects he never failed. It was in the columns of the same journal that several of those works

appeared on which his fame will securely rest. The scientific world were astonished by a series of papers remarkable indeed for the beauty and purity of their style, but much more remarkable for still higher qualities—papers, which lighted up with all the graces of imagination the details of a science usually obscure and dry; founded its conclusions on extraordinary powers of analysis, and connected the whole with the noblest speculations on the history and destiny of the world. Thus appeared in succession ‘The Old Red Sandstone,’ ‘First Impressions of England and its People;’ ‘My Schools and Schoolmasters,’ besides many occasional papers on literature and science.

In reviewing these works, and especially the circumstances under which they were produced, we must not fail to take due account of that which underlies every possibility of success in the higher walks of intellectual exertion. Miller in one of his works has spoken of ‘that mysterious substance on whose place and development so very much in the scheme of creation was destined to depend.’ He was himself, alas, to afford a new example of the mutual dependence between the action of the mind and the physical condition of the organ with which it holds mysterious alliance. Beyond all doubt he was born with a powerful instrument at his command. His mind was large, sensitive, and finely strung. Genius had endowed him with her incommunicable gifts. And as for higher excellences this is an all-sufficient explanation, so also is it the real source of the main elements of literary skill. A bad style is generally indicative of a feeble intellect. Clear conceptions will find, for the most part, clear expression: and even when the task of the writer is to render back faint and distant echoes which have reached no other ear than his, the same faculty which enables himself to catch them, will often without an effort make them audible to the world. There was nothing in Miller’s works which so much surprised the public as their mere literary merit. Where could this Cromarty mason have acquired his style? The surprise was natural. Miller was what from his position in life he might be presumed to be,—he was, in the technical sense of the word, an uneducated man. He knew little of any language but his own; and even this he never could pronounce intelligibly to an English ear. In this sense he was far less educated than many of his own class in his own country, or than his own opportunities might have enabled him to be. The clergy of Scotland have almost all received more than the elements of education at its parish schools; and at least a rudimentary knowledge of the learned languages is generally attainable within their walls.

These opportunities were not altogether wanting to him; but, as he himself tells us, they were neglected.

Yet the truth is, that Miller had an education, in the higher senses of the word, with which few other educations can compare. There is no culture like that of one who loves reading, and has only a few of the best books to read. His writings show an extensive knowledge of English literature; but it was gathered slowly, through the course of years, from volumes acquired singly and at intervals,—from his father's shipwrecked shelves,—from patronising dominies—'sticket ministers,' and travelling pedlars. Miscellaneous as this reading was, he seems to have liked best that which was best worth liking. The great classic writers of English literature were his chosen friends. He read them in long solitary evenings; and in evenings not solitary, but loud with conversation which he could not enjoy. He read them in the intervals of labour, straining his eyes over their pages by the light of bothy-fires, and the long glow of northern summer nights. The enjoyment he had in them defended him from temptations for the terrible strength of which over the labouring classes we sometimes perhaps make hardly enough allowance. The drinking vices of many callings are nearly connected with physical trials. Miller tells us that under the influence of discomfort and fatigue he had begun to yield; when retiring one night to his hour of reading, he found the stately sentences of Bacon emptied of all their noble meaning. The resolution taken in that moment of conscious debasement was ever after kept. His opportunities of self-improvement were never again thus voluntarily lost. Passing from the illustrious names—

'That fill

The spacious times of great Elizabeth

With sounds that echo still,'

he became familiar in the same way with most of the poets and novelists of the later stages of English literature—with Pope and Dryden, with Swift and Richardson, with Gray and Cowper, with Addison and Goldsmith. A retentive memory kept for him all he read; a fine natural taste determined his likings well, and a genial disposition made him live with those whose writings he admired. The degree in which he had lived with them became evident in his 'First Impressions of England and its People.' He never crossed the border till he was far advanced in life. But when he did so, it is impossible to mistake the familiar greeting with which he hailed the homes of England most associated with the genius, the virtue or the piety of her sons. With what tenderness of feeling he describes his visit to Olney, and how often must he have traced before in imagination those

old avenues in the park of the Throckmortons, which were the favourite resort of Cowper, 'the sweet poet,' as Miller fondly calls him, 'who first poured the stream of divine truth into the channels of our literature.' All the woods and fields round 'Yardley Oak' had long been as familiar to him as the wave-worn Sutors of Cromarty, or the fine outline of Ben Wyvis. Probably few men now read the poetry of Shenstone, and the landscape gardening of the Leasowes is pretty well forgotten. But all its old ponds and waterfalls, its glades and vistas, had been known to Miller, and he spends some hours in tracing their decay. At Hagley he was at home in the landscape of 'the Seasons,' and not less in the personal history of those from whose descriptions it was known. He recounts the strangely contrasted character of the elder and the younger Lyttleton, and in its parish church, as over the grave of a friend, he repeats to himself the famous Monody. In the streets of London his recollections were of the houseless wanderings and poverty of Otway, and Butler, and Chatterton, and Savage, and Crabbe, and Johnson. Not very many of those who pass through colleges and schools were as worthy as this Cromarty mason to tread the pavement of Poets' Corner; not many could say with equal truth,—

'I had got fairly among my patrons and benefactors. How often, shut out for months and years together from all literary converse with the living, had they been almost my only companions,—my unseen associates, who in the rude workshed lightened my labour by the music of their numbers; and who in my evening walks, that would have been so solitary but for them, expanded my intellect by the solid bulk of their thinking, and gave me eyes, by their exquisite descriptions, to look at nature.' (*First Impressions*, ch. xviii.)

With such love for such teachers we may cease to wonder at Miller's command over the resources of the English language. Nor must we omit to mention the influence of other circumstances in his condition. Cromarty, without being itself very picturesquely situated, is within view of great natural features. There is the sea in both its aspects,—the long swell of comparatively open water, and the quiet recesses of a noble harbour, the best and almost the only one along hundreds of miles of coast. Both were associated in his early memory with those eventful moments and vicissitudes in life of which in all ages they have been taken as the type. He had watched his father's vessel going and returning, until at last he had watched in vain. Then upon the other side was a view of the everlasting hills. The outer borders of a Highland country are in many respects more favourable to enjoyment of its beauty than the interior. A low horizon, with a distant outline, is an inexhaustible source

of variety and interest. Every change of atmosphere is as it were a change of country. Evening is more beautiful than elsewhere, and the working man, called to early labour, sees as he can see in no other situation the effect of 'morning spread 'upon the mountains.' Miller's enjoyment of nature was intense, enlightened by the happy union of science and of taste. The introductory chapter of the 'Old Red Sandstone' describes his first day of labour in opening a quarry on the upper shores of the Cromarty Firth. It is but one of his lighter sketches, but drawn with truth and feeling.

But we pass from the literary framework of his thinking to the solid materials they contained. Miller's mastery over the science which he has done so much to illustrate, was acquired under similar circumstances of apparent difficulty and of real advantage. Making again due allowance for the natural powers of a mind which observed every thing, and reasoned on every thing it observed, his scientific education was the most perfect in the world. There is no knowledge so thorough as that which is gained at last after years of baffled and wondering inquiry. His facts were accumulated for himself, and his calling supplied him with abundant opportunities for collecting them. On the first day on which he began labour in a quarry, a great slab of rock had to be lifted from its bed, and when that bed was exposed to view, it presented on its surface the grainy ripple of primeval seas.

'It was ridged and furrowed like a bank of sand that had been left an hour before. I could trace every bend and curvature, every cross hollow and counteridge of the corresponding phenomena—for the resemblance was no half resemblance; it was the thing itself; and I had observed it a hundred and a hundred times, when sailing my little schooner in the shallows left by the ebb.' (*Old Red*, ch. i.)

Whilst soon after similarly employed in another part of the same district, he found an ammonite—that noble convoluted form so often repeated in different provinces of the Natural Kingdom, and, at second hand, in not a few departments of decorative art. Looking at this object in reference to this form alone, Miller speaks of it as it then not unnaturally appeared to him—'a beautifully finished piece of sculpture—one of the 'volutes apparently of an Ionic capital.' A fellow workman told him of a spot on the neighbouring coast, where these and other stones 'like thunderbolts' were found. The first half-holiday was devoted to the search; and what he found in the rocks he was in search of, can be told in no words half so descriptive as his own:—

'I found them composed of thin strata of limestone, alternating with

thicker beds of a black, slaty substance, which, as I ascertained in the course of the evening, burns with a powerful flame and emits a strong bituminous odour. The layers with which the beds readily separate, are hardly an eighth of an inch in thickness, and yet on every layer there are the impressions of thousands and tens of thousands of the various fossils peculiar to the Lias. We may turn over wonderful leaves one by one like the leaves of an herbarium and find the historical records of a former creation in every page: scallops and gryphites and ammonites of almost every variety peculiar to the formation, and at least some eight or ten varieties of belemnites; twigs of wood, leaves of plants, cones of an extinct species of pine; bits of charcoal, and the scales of fishes; and as if to render their pictorial appearance more striking, though the leaves of this interesting volume are of a deep black, most of the impressions are of a chalky whiteness. I was lost in admiration and astonishment, and found my very imagination paralysed by an assemblage of wonders that seemed to outrival, in the fantastic and the extravagant, even its wildest conceptions. I passed on from ledge to ledge like the traveller of the tale through the City of Statues.' (*Old Red*, ch. i.)

Strange and ancient as were the fossils of the Lias, he soon broke ground upon remains less beautiful but infinitely more uncouth, and, as he afterwards came to know — older by unnumbered ages. In puzzling over these strata of the Lias, and trying to understand their relation to the adjacent rocks, he did what must be done under such circumstances — he formed a theory, — and if that theory were right, he concluded he should find the same beds recurring at another point of the coast in a bay close to his native town. And so, 'one delightful morning in August 1830,' he set out to explore the rocks exposed there by the lowest ebb. He soon found some strata abounding in calcareous nodules.

'So thickly are the nodules spread over the surface of some of the beds, that they reminded me of floats of broken ice on the windward side of a lake after a few days' thaw, when the edges of the fragments are smoothed and rounded, and they press upon one another, so as to cover, except in the angular interstices, the entire surface. I set myself carefully to examine. The first nodule I laid open contained a bituminous-looking mass, in which I could trace a few pointed bones and a few minute scales. The next abounded in rhomboidal and finely enamelled scales of much larger size and more distinct character. I wrought on with the eagerness of a discoverer entering for the first time in a *terra incognita* of wonders. Almost every fragment of clay, every splinter of sandstone, every limestone nodule, contained its organism — scales, spines, plates, bones, entire fish; but not one organism of the Lias could I find — no ammonite, no belemnites, no gryphites, no shells of any kind: the vegetable impressions were entirely different; and not a single scale, plate or ichthyodo-

rulite, could I identify with those of the newer formation. I had got into a different world, and among the remains of a different creation; but where was its proper place in the scale? The beds of the little bay are encircled by thick accumulations of diluvium and *débris*, nor could I trace their relation to a single known rock. I was struck, as I well might, by the utter strangeness of the forms, — the oar-like arms of the *Pterichthys*, and its tortoise-like plates — the strange buckler-looking head of the *Coccoosteus*, which, I suppose, might possibly be the back of a small tortoise, though the tubercles reminded me rather of the skin of the shark — the polished scales and plates of the *Osteolepis* — the spined and scaled fins of the *Cheiracanthus* — above all, the one-sided tail of at least eight out of the ten or twelve varieties of fossil which the deposit contained. All together excited and astonished me. I wrought on till the advancing tide came splashing over the nodules, and a powerful August sun had risen towards the middle sky; and were I to sum up all my happier hours, the hour would not be forgotten in which I sat down on a rounded boulder of granite, by the edge of the sea, when the last bed was covered, and spread out on the beach before me the spoils of the morning.' (*Old Red*, ch. vi.)

Miller was not then aware of the value of his discovery. Geology is so young a science that even small portions of a single life have seen great changes in its progress. It was only in the earlier years of the present century that its foundation, as a science properly so called, was laid in the establishment of the great principle that strata are to be identified by their imbedded fossils — that different ages of creation have been distinguished by different forms of animal and vegetable life, and that by the remains of these, under every variety of colour and of texture, the same formation can always be detected. It was upon the rich and abundant fossils of that very formation which first arrested the attention of Miller, the Lias, which with the superincumbent Oolite covers a large part of England, that this principle had been first established and applied. Under its guidance the leading masses of the 'secondary rocks' were soon classified and arranged. The wonderful remains of the carboniferous vegetation had been long practically known, and under the new law this great system of deposits had speedily its true place assigned to it with reference to the strata both above and under it. With respect to one of these it was known by costly experience that the 'coal-measures' were frequently overlaid by beds of red sandstone, sometimes of such enormous thickness as to render hopeless all access to the treasures underneath. With respect to another, it was also known that these same coal-measures were underlaid by other masses of red sandstone in which no coal was found. These relative positions had assigned to the

first the name of the 'New,' and to the last that of the 'Old Red Sandstone.' Both came rather slowly to be separated from the coal-measures, or to be regarded in any other light than as the floor and the roof respectively of the carboniferous strata. Rising from under the coal-basins of Shropshire and South Wales the 'Old Red' was seen to spread over a large part of the western and south-western counties of England. It rose to high mountains in Brecon and Carmarthen, and beds of the same deposit gave their rich and peculiar colouring to the beautiful shores of Devon. In Scotland likewise considerable districts of country were occupied by strata whose relation to the primary rocks beneath indicated the same relations. But throughout all these areas in both countries hardly any organic remains had been discovered. In 1827 the sagacity of Murchison and Sedgwick referred to the 'Old Red' certain rocks in Caithness which were largely quarried for flagstones and which were found to contain the remains of some peculiar fish. Soon after, the late Professor Fleming, to whom science in many departments owes so much, discovered in Forfarshire some similar remains, and Sir Charles Lyell was an early contributor from the same field. But a few ambiguous impressions, as if of miniature shields and bucklers, were all that for long rewarded the search of English geologists in the 'Old Red' strata of that country. So late as 1836, when Buckland published his celebrated *Bridgewater Treatise*, we find no engraving, such as is given for other strata, to indicate any forms of life peculiar to the ages of the Old Red Sandstone; and a short note, appended apparently after the text had been prepared, disposes of the Scotch discoveries as of interest indeed, but still only as disclosing remains of fish closely related to those connected with the coal. Miller, in his walk on 'that delightful morning of August, 1830,'—six years earlier, had lighted on a stratum of these 'Old Red' rocks which revealed in a moment the strange and peculiar creatures which had lived during the ages of their deposition, and which had perished as utterly before the carboniferous vegetation had begun to grow, as this vegetation again had perished before the introduction of the lizards and ammonites of the Lias.

For several years he worked on, entirely unassisted from without, but applying with assiduous labour to the collection of his specimens, and with powers of curious and accurate analysis to the structure of the animals he discovered. In the conclusions to which his discoveries would have led he was anticipated by a distinguished countryman. Murchison, during the

progress of his great work on the Silurian System, was gathering during the same years some additional evidence to that which was already known of the organisms of the 'Old Red,'—evidence which, with his eye for rapid yet sound generalisation, enabled him to appreciate more justly the true importance of the 'Old Red' as the remains of ages wholly separate from those which produced the coal-measures. This view was maintained in the 'Silurian System,' published in 1839. Meanwhile Miller, to use the sailor's phrase, was 'coming up with a wet sail.' He had communicated to Murchison some of his specimens, and had received from him encouragement and assistance; following up his own researches, he very soon made himself master also of the literature of the rising science, dovetailing it with nice and curious connexion into his own earlier reading. He worked with such a will, and, consequently, with such success, that in the very first year of his residence in Edinburgh as editor of the 'Witness,' he published in that journal the series of papers which constitute his work on the 'Old Red Sandstone,' the first, the freshest, and, we think, the best of all his scientific writings.

The jealousy which exists among men of science has often been the subject of invidious remark. On this occasion there was nothing but the most generous emulation in acknowledging the new author's extraordinary powers. At the meeting of the British Association held at Glasgow in 1840, Murchison introduced the subject of Miller's discoveries, and referred to his recent papers in terms of just and hearty admiration. Buckland, the accomplished and eloquent Professor of Oxford, declared 'he would give his right hand to possess such powers 'of description as this man,' and spoke of the comparative meagreness and poverty of his own. The real charm, however, as well as the real value of his work, lay deeper than its mere descriptions. Miller's mind was intensely interested in the questions which geology suggested, and to these all his descriptions are subordinate. We can only take a few as an example. How came so many strata of the Old Red Sandstone to be so barren of fossil remains, giving the idea of such long periods of time almost destitute of life? A very important question this—touching as it does upon the peculiar conditions requisite for the preservation of such remains, and the safety of building conclusions upon their absence. Miller sees one explanation in his walk upon the beach. He recurs to his favourite bay.

'It was laid bare by the tide this morning far beyond its outer opening; and the huge table-like boulder, which occupies nearly its centre, held but a middle place between the still-darkened flood-line

that ran high along the beach, and the brown line of ebb that bristled far below with forests of the rough-stemmed tangle. This little bay or inflection of the coast serves as a sort of natural wear in detaining floating drift-weed, and is often found piled, after violent storms from the east, with accumulations, many yards in extent and several feet in depth, of kelp and tangle, mixed with zoophytes and mollusca, and the remains of fish killed among the shallows by the tempest. Early in the last century, a large body of herrings, pursued by whales and porpoises, were stranded in it, to the amount of several hundred barrels; and it is said that salt and cask failed the packers when but comparatively a small portion of the shoal were cured, and that by much the greatest part of them were carried away by the neighbouring farmers for manure. Ever since the formation of the present coast-line, this natural wear has been arresting, tide after tide, its heaps of organic matter, but the circumstances favourable to their preservation have been wanting: they ferment and decay when driven high on the beach; and the next spring-tide, accompanied by a gale from the west, sweeps every vestige of them away; and so, after the lapse of many centuries, we find no other organisms among the rounded pebbles that form the beach of this little bay, than merely a few broken shells and occasionally a mouldering fish-bone. Thus, very barren formations may belong to periods singularly rich in organic existences.' (*Old Red*, ch. vi.)

Again, the barrenness of these strata is less astonishing than the fertility of others. Certain beds suddenly turn up, extending, perhaps, over wide areas of country, which seem almost entirely composed of animal remains. Here an opposite difficulty is presented, and we are almost tempted to ask — Is life anywhere as concentrated and as abundant now? Miller, in imagining that old world, always connects it with what he has seen of nature in its existing aspect.

'Here we first find proof that this ancient ocean literally swarmed with life — that its bottom was literally covered with miniature forests of algæ, and its waters darkened by immense shoals of fish. In middle autumn, at the close of the herring season, when the fish have just spawned, and the congregated masses are breaking up on shallow and skerry, and dispersing by myriads over the deeper seas, they rise at times to the surface by a movement so simultaneous, that for miles and miles around the skiff of the fisherman nothing may be seen but the bright glitter of scales, as if the entire face of the deep were a blue robe spangled with silver. I have watched them at sunrise at such seasons on the middle of the Moray Firth, when, far as the eye could reach, the surface has been ruffled by the splash of fins as if a light breeze swept over it, and the red light has flashed in glimmers of an instant on the millions and tens of millions that were leaping around me, a hand-breadth into the air, thick as hailstones in a thunder shower. The amazing amount of life which the scene included has imparted to it an indescribable interest. On most oc-

032401
vol. 108. (Pt. 1+2)

casions the inhabitants of ocean are seen but by scores and hundreds; for in looking down into their twilight haunts, we find the view bounded by a few yards, or at most a few fathoms; and we can but calculate on the unseen myriads of the surrounding expanse, by the seen few that occupy the narrow space visible. Here, however, it was not the few, but the myriads, that were seen—the innumerable and inconceivable whole all palpable to the sight as a flock on a hill-side; or at least, if all was not palpable, it was only because sense has its limits in the lighter as well as in the denser medium,—that the multitudinous distracts it, and the distant eludes it, and the far horizon bounds it. If the scene spoke not of infinity in the sense in which Deity comprehends it, it spoke of it in at least the only sense in which man can comprehend it.' (*Old Red*, ch. xii.)

But we must pass to descriptions of another kind. Those old shoals of fish—what were they? Could they in respect to organisation, as well as in respect to number, be compared with the herrings of the Moray Firth, or with any other fish of the existing seas? To reconstruct the animal he found more difficult than to imagine the scenes in which it lived. We have an instinctive confidence in the sameness of the great elements of nature—and in the permanence of the mechanical laws which regulate their mutual action. But the variety of animal life which even now is so vast, what may it not have been in past time? One at least of the creatures examined by Miller, subsequently named by Agassiz the '*Pterichthys Milleri*,' seemed wholly inexplicable.

'It opened with a single blow of the hammer; and there, on a ground of light-coloured limestone, lay the effigy of a creature fashioned apparently out of jet, with a body covered with plates, two powerful-looking arms articulated at the shoulders, a head as entirely lost in the trunk as that of the ray or the sun-fish, and a long angular tail. My first-formed idea regarding it was, that I had discovered a connecting link between the tortoise and the fish.' (*Old Red*, ch. iii.)

Others of the animals which he found were indeed obviously fish, but fish of a shape and style which he had never seen and of which he had never heard.

'Scales of bone glisten with enamel; their jaws, enamel without, and bone within, bristle thick with sharp-pointed teeth; closely-jointed plates, burnished like ancient helmets, cover their heads; their gill-covers consist each of a single piece, like the gill-cover of the sturgeon; their tails were formed chiefly on the lower side of their bodies; and the rays of their fins, enamelled like their plates and their scales, stand up over the connecting membrane, like the steel or brass in that peculiar armour of the middle ages, whose multitudinous pieces of metal were fastened together on a ground-work of cloth or of leather.' (*Old Red*, ch. iv.)

Warrington Jainrishna Public Library

Acq. No. 7525 Date 23.7.75

But there were great differences of detail. Of one he found that

‘the head had its plaited mail, the body its scaly mail, the fins their mail of parallel and jointed bars, and every plate, bar, and scale was dotted with microscopic points. Every ray had its double or treble punctulated row, every scale or plate its punctulated group; the markings lie as thickly in proportion to the fields they cover as the circular perforations in a lace veil.’ (*Old Red*, ch. v.)

In another,

‘an entirely different style obtains. The enamelled scales and plates glitter with minute ridges, that show like thorns in a December morning varnished with ice.’

In another,

‘the bones and scales seemed disproportionately large. There is a general rudeness in the finish of the creature, if I may so speak, that reminds one of the tatooings of a savage, or the corresponding style of art in which he ornaments the handle of his stone hatchet or his war-club.’

In a fourth,

‘on the contrary, there is much of a minute and cabinet-like elegance. The silvery smoothness of the fins, dotted with scarcely visible scales, harmonised with a similar appearance of head; a style of sculpture resembling the parallel etchings of the line-engraver fretted the scales.’

Here, again, all this minute and graphic description is subordinate to the recognition of great general laws. He points to the perfect unity or consistency of style which prevails in each, traces to the same principle the highest beauty in human art, and indicates in this fine observation some of the deepest facts in nature:—

‘Nor does it lessen the wonder that their nicer ornaments should yield their beauty only to the microscope, and the unassisted eye fails to discover the evidences of this unity: it would seem as if the adorable Architect had wrought it out in secret with reference to the divine idea alone. The artist who sculptured a cherry-stone, consigned it to a cabinet and placed a microscope beside it. The microscopic beauty of these ancient fish was consigned to the twilight depths of a primeval ocean.’ . . . ‘We speak of the infinity of Deity—of His inexhaustible variety of mind; but we speak of it until the idea becomes a piece of mere commonplace in our mouths. It is well to be brought to feel, if not to conceive of it—to be made to know that we ourselves are ~~human~~ ^{finite} ~~men~~ ^{finite} ~~mind~~ ^{finite} ~~and~~ ^{finite} ~~that~~ ^{finite} ~~in~~ ^{finite} ~~Him~~ ^{finite} ~~“all~~ ^{finite} ~~fulness~~ ^{finite} ~~dwell~~ ^{finite} ~~eth.”~~ ^{finite} ~~Succeed-~~ ^{finite} ~~ing~~ ^{finite} ~~creations,~~ ^{finite} ~~each~~ ^{finite} ~~with~~ ^{finite} ~~its~~ ^{finite} ~~myriads~~ ^{finite} ~~of~~ ^{finite} ~~existences,~~ ^{finite} ~~do~~ ^{finite} ~~not~~ ^{finite} ~~exhaust~~ ^{finite} ~~Him.~~ ^{finite} ~~He~~ ^{finite} ~~never~~ ^{finite} ~~repeats~~ ^{finite} ~~Himself.~~ ^{finite} ~~The~~ ^{finite} ~~curtain~~ ^{finite} ~~drops~~ ^{finite} ~~at~~ ^{finite} ~~His~~ ^{finite} ~~command~~ ^{finite} ~~over~~ ^{finite} ~~one~~ ^{finite} ~~scene~~ ^{finite} ~~of~~ ^{finite} ~~existence~~ ^{finite} ~~full~~ ^{finite} ~~of~~ ^{finite} ~~wisdom~~ ^{finite} ~~and~~ ^{finite} ~~beauty~~ ^{finite} ~~—~~ ^{finite} ~~it~~ ^{finite} ~~rises~~ ^{finite} ~~again,~~ ^{finite}

and all is glorious, wise, and beautiful as before, and all is new. . . . 'Is it nothing to be taught with a demonstrative evidence which the metaphysician cannot supply, that races are not eternal — that every family had its beginning, and that whole creations have come to an end?' (*Old Red*, ch. v.)

In this passage, as well as in many others of the '*Old Red Sandstone*,' Miller anticipates the conclusion, and in some respects the arguments, which were to form the subject of his next principal scientific work. The '*Footprints of the Creator*' was one of the many answers called forth by the '*Vestiges of Creation*' — and in some respects it was the most systematic as well as the most eloquent of them all. This controversy was not in substance new, but it was fought upon a new ground. During the few years of its existence as an established science, geology had yielded authentic information upon questions on which no other department of knowledge had supplied so much as one solitary hint. All other sciences had borne exclusive reference to the existing order of things. Geology, for the first time, spoke to us of the past history of creation. This was absolutely new. It was new in kind, not merely in degree. Of the first introduction of any new form of life, whether plant or animal, we had known before absolutely nothing. The very idea seemed to lie beyond the domain of science, — and so in one sense it does, — that is to say, it lies beyond the domain of any known natural law. It is a fact which we cannot refer to any other fact more general than itself. Hence the controversy respecting it. For there are two tendencies in the human mind, not necessarily antagonistic, but which are too often found apart. One of these tendencies is that which impels us to trace up all particular facts to some general rule or law; the other is that which impels us to seek behind the law for the authority which has laid it down; and to rejoice in every evidence which indicates more nearly and more clearly than others, the direct action of a personal Creator. There are many minds in which the first of these tendencies throws out the last. They are satisfied with physical laws as ultimate truths. They conceal from themselves how little those laws satisfy our own ideas of causation, by borrowing, as it were, from the world of mind, and lending to physical laws the attributes of volition.

Never was such new and abundant food supplied to diverse appetites, as by these new facts of geology were afforded to these two tendencies of mind. On the one hand, the discovery that creation has not been one solitary act, to be presumed from argument or received by faith, but an act many times repeated, leaving visible records to inform us of the fact, seemed almost

to bring us into the position of finding the Creator at his work. It was like ascending at least one step higher.

‘The great world’s altar-stairs
That slope through darkness up to God.’

It gave new scope to the argument of St. Peter, which he urges against the assertion, ‘that all things have continued as they are since the beginning.’ It now appeared, that not only had there been ‘a beginning,’ but many beginnings; and periods of long-established order many times broken up. On the other hand, there has been a struggle to bring these facts within the domain of natural law; for in science there is nothing so uncomfortable as a fact which cannot be assimilated with other facts belonging to the ordinary course of nature. Nor is this endeavour to be deprecated if it be conducted in the true spirit of inductive reasoning. The late lamented Professor Edward Forbes did fancy that he could trace in the distribution of animal life in past time a law, in the strict scientific sense of that term; that is to say, he fancied that the facts as hitherto ascertained, were capable of being reduced under a more general definition. But the ‘Vestiges’ was an attempt of a very different kind—an attempt not merely to classify the facts, but to refer them to a new causation, and to give to an assumed law an explanatory character which really belongs to no physical law whatever. The object was not simply to trace the order in which, but to devise the process by which, successive creations had been introduced. And this process was no other than ‘development.’ Under the combined influence of internal aspirations and of external conditions, the lower animals had, in the lapse of ages, gradually grown into the highest forms of life. In reality, this was no new idea. Something like it, at least, had been successively a tenet of the schools, a dream of the metaphysician, and a fancy of the poet. But to those old theories the new facts, superficially understood, seemed to lend a sort of shadowy support. There had been, apparently, a progress in the history of creation. It had begun with worms and trilobites,—it had advanced to fishes and lizards; and from these, again, it rose to mammals, of which, man by a vast difference the latest, had, by a vast difference of time, been created last. But were the steps in this progress really continuous; and were they such in kind and in degree as can be connected with any sort of growth or development of individual organisms? In the investigation of these questions, and of many others into which the controversy branches out, Miller found ample exercise for all his powers. Nothing in his works exhibits so well the grasp of

his mind as the mastery he speedily acquired over the science of comparative anatomy, from the minute details in the accumulation of which its foundations have been laid, to the systematic results established by Cuvier, and the great abstract ideas, grander still, which have been traced by Owen. No one knew better than Miller that safe conclusions can only be founded on the most microscopic examination; or, to quote the striking words in which Professor Owen lately expressed this truth, 'that nature never proclaims her secrets with a loud voice, but always 'whispers them.' Much, accordingly, of the 'Footprints of the 'Creator' is devoted to minute analytical detail; but everywhere picturesqueness of description is made admirably subservient to the explanation of the argument.

He admits and accepts the fact of progress in the order of creation — yet not a progress gradual and continuous from individual to individual, such as is required by the hypothesis of development: but a progress by leaps, as it were, from class to class, each class being introduced not by degrees or in its lowest, but in its highest and most complicated form. Of this he finds abundant evidence in his own special branch of discovery. Fish are the lowest class in the great order of the vertebrata. The fish of the Old Red are the second oldest of their class; whilst those of the Silurian strata are the first.

'Were these fishes,' says Miller, 'of a bulk so inconsiderable as in any degree to sanction the belief that they had been developed shortly before from microscopic points? Or were they of a structure so low as to render it probable that their development was at the time incomplete? Were they, in other words, the embryos and fetuses of their class, or did they on the contrary rank with the higher and larger fishes of the present time?' (*Footprints*, ch. vi.)

This question, which had then been already dealt with in the pages of this Review, Miller discusses and answers with admirable clearness. He justly insists that in estimating the comparative elevation of different animals in the scale of being, it be not measured by some arbitrary standard applied perhaps to but one feature of their structure; as, for example, when it is measured by the material, bone or cartilage, of which their skeleton is composed; and, above all, he insists that this estimate should include, as after all its truest and safest element, the development of mind in animals, and of the brain its material organ. The earliest fish of which there is any trace, were cartilaginous, it is true, but so are the existing sharks, the family to which the Silurian fishes apparently belonged. And where do the sharks stand among the fishes of the existing world?

'I have compared,' says Miller, 'the brain of the spotted dog-fish with that of a young alligator, and have found that in scarce any perceptible degree was it inferior, in point of bulk, and very slightly indeed in point of organisation, to the brain of the reptile. And the instincts of this placoid family, — one of the truest existing representatives of the placoids of the Silurian system to which we can appeal, — correspond, we invariably find, with their superior cerebral development. I have seen the common dog-fish, *Spinax Acanthias*, hovering in packs in the Moray Firth, some one or two fathoms away from the side of the herring boat from which, when the fishermen were engaged in hauling their nets, I have watched them, and have admired the caution which, with all their ferocity of disposition, they rarely failed to manifest; — how they kept aloof from the net, even more warily than the cetacea themselves. . . . And I have been assured by intelligent fishermen, that at the deep-sea white-fishing, in which baited hooks, not nets, are employed, the degree of shrewd caution-exercised by these creatures seems more extraordinary still. The hatred which the fisher bears to them arises not more from the actual amount of mischief which they do him, than from the circumstance that in most cases they persist in doing it with complete impunity to themselves.' (*Footprints*, ch. viii.) *

We close our quotations on this portion of his works with two others; one summing up the result which science has arrived at, and another connecting that result with the author's natural and, we believe, just idea of their final cause.

'We know, as geologists, that the dynasty of the fish was succeeded by that of the reptile, — that the dynasty of the reptile was succeeded by that of the mammiferous quadruped, — and that the dynasty of the mammiferous quadruped was succeeded by that of man as man now exists, — a creature of mixed character, and subject, in all conditions, to wide alternations of enjoyment and suffering. We know, further, — so far at least as we have yet succeeded in deciphering the record, — that the several dynasties were introduced not in their lower, but in their higher forms; — that, in short, in the imposing programme of creation it was arranged, as a general rule, that in each of the great divisions of the procession the magnates should walk first.' (*Footprints*, ch. xv.)

And as it thus appears certain that uniformity has not prevailed since 'the beginning' as respects the types chosen for the embodiment of life, so neither did Miller believe in uniformity as respects the physical conditions in which that life had found enjoyment. He connected the clear evidence of progress in the one, with evidence which he thought not less clear of progress and preparation in the other.

'The reasoning brain would have been wholly at fault in a scene of things in which it could neither foresee the exterminating calamity while yet distant, nor control it when it had come; and so the rea-

soning brain was not produced until the scene had undergone a slow but thorough process of change, during which, at each progressive stage, it had furnished a platform for higher and still higher life. When the coniferæ could flourish on the land, and fishes subsist in the seas, fishes and cone-bearing plants were created; when the earth became a fit habitat for reptiles and birds, reptiles and birds were produced; with the dawn of a more stable and mature state of things the sagacious quadruped was ushered in; and, last of all, when man's house was fully prepared for him, — when the data on which it is his nature to reason and calculate had become fixed and certain, — the reasoning, calculating brain was moulded by the creative finger, and man became a living soul. Such seems to be the true reading of the wondrous inscription chiselled deep in the rocks. It furnishes us with no clue by which to unravel the unapproachable mysteries of creation; these mysteries belong to the wondrous Creator, and to Him only. We attempt to theorise upon them, and to reduce them to law, and all nature rises up against us in our presumptuous rebellion. A stray splinter of cone-bearing wood, — a fish's skull or tooth, — the vertebra of a reptile, — the humerus of a bird, — the jaw of a quadruped, — all, any of these things, weak and insignificant as they may seem, become in such a quarrel too strong for us and our theory: the puny fragment, in the grasp of truth, forms as irresistible a weapon as the dry bone did in that of Samson of old; and our slaughtered sophisms lie piled up, "heaps upon heaps," before it.' (*Footprints*, ch. xv.)

We should be neglecting a very important feature in the character and works of Miller, did we fail to notice those views of philosophy and religion which he connected so closely — as many think, too closely — with his scientific investigations. Miller has himself very truly observed that the parts of Scotland to the North of the Grampians had a much later development of those peculiarities in its religious history which have left so strong an impress on the national character. Those times which, as Wordsworth has said, 'ring through Scotland 'to this hour,' ring still more loudly there; for they were times much nearer to our own; and the grasp of the Presbyterian theology over the mind and affections of the people is even now more complete than among the larger populations of the South. The account which Miller has given us of the teaching of his maternal uncles, on Sunday evenings, is a remarkable picture of that intelligent devotion which is the best type of the piety of Scotland. Very different companions surrounded him when he went to Edinburgh; and, but for the strong anchors which had been thus early cast into the retentive holding-ground of his mind, he would probably have added to the number of those who, under temptations without and difficulties within, have drifted from all definite religious faith. His natural love

of metaphysical speculation had introduced him early, amongst his various reading, to the works of Hume, as well as to those of his principal opponents. The fallacy of conclusions, opposed to the universal instincts of mankind, could not easily deceive him; but neither could some of the replies which, in defence of those instincts, had been framed by healthier minds, but by intellects less acute. Thus, when at a later period of his life, after his return to Cromarty, his convictions became settled, he continued sensible to many errors, both in the popular philosophy and the popular theology of his country. There are in 'My Schools, &c.' some remarks on certain forms of pulpit teaching, not uncommon on either side of the Tweed, which are admirable for their good sense, and may, we think, be considered with advantage by the clergy of both countries.

We have seen that one main source of the interest he took in his favourite science, lay in its bearing upon the most difficult questions of natural theology. If, in dwelling on this high theme, his thoughts were sometimes fanciful, we must be careful to distinguish between the nature of his error and that of those who ordinarily confound the provinces of science and religion. He never failed to assert the freedom of physical research. It is well known with what resistance the discoveries of geology were met at first by the religious world. That stage of the controversy is now nearly past. But when Miller began his studies, and among those with whom he had very close relations, it was a form of thought with which he was perpetually brought in contact. Nothing can be clearer or more just than the principle on which he vindicates the independence of scientific investigation. We quote a characteristic passage:—

'It may have been merely the effect of an engrossing study long prosecuted; but so it was, that of all I had witnessed among the scenes rendered classic by the muse of Cowper, nothing more permanently impressed me than the few broken fossils of the Oolite which I had picked up immediately opposite the poet's windows. There had they lain, as carelessly indifferent to the strictures in the "Task" as the sun in the central heavens, two centuries before, to the denunciations of the Inquisition. Geology, however, in the days of Cowper, had not attained to the dignity of a science. It lacked solid footing as it journeyed amid the wastes of chaos; and now tipped, as with its toe-points, a "crude-consistence" of ill-understood ~~and~~ and now rose aloft into an atmosphere of obscure conjecture, "tumultuous cloud" of ill-digested theory. In a science in this informed, rudimental stage, whether it deals with the stars of heaven or the strata of the earth, the old anarchy of infidelity is sure always to effect a transitory lodgment. . . . Geology, now, however,

though still a youthful science, is no longer an immature one: It has got firm footing on a continent of fact; and the man who labours to set the doctrines of Revelation in array against its legitimate deductions, is employed, whatever may be his own estimate of his vocation, not on the side of religious truth, but of scepticism and infidelity. No scientific question was ever yet settled dogmatically, nor ever will. If the question be one in the science of numbers, it must be settled arithmetically; if in the science of geometry, it must be settled mathematically; if in the science of chemistry, it must be settled experimentally. Now, ultimately at least, as men have yielded to astronomy the right of decision in all astronomical questions, must they resign to geology the settlement of all geological ones. I do not merely speak of what *ought*, but of what assuredly *must* and *will* be. The successive geologic systems and formations, with all their organic contents, are as real existences as the sun itself; and it is quite as possible to demonstrate their true place and position, relative and absolute. And so long as certain fixed laws control and regulate human belief, certain inevitable deductions must and will continue to be based on the facts which these systems and formations furnish.' (*First Impressions*, ch. xvii.)

But the independence of science, in the investigation of her facts and the ascertainment of her laws, is perfectly consistent with a very close relation between the results thus obtained, and other branches of inquiry. Miller's acquaintance with the sceptical writers of the last century had taught him the intimate connexion between physical and metaphysical speculation. In this sense it is idle to deprecate the connexion of science with religion. That connexion exists, whether we choose to recognise it or not. At every step of our progress in the one, long avenues of thought are seen leading off into the other. The ultimate ideas, traceable in the material and immaterial worlds, are often identical with each other. Language, that great instrument of human thought, is a constant witness to the fact. We are hardly conscious how perpetually we are applying to the phenomena of mind conceptions, primarily derived from those of matter. We recognise the transfer as metaphorical only when the analogy is less than usually familiar. 'All things,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'are full of such resemblances;' and it is the high prerogative of genius to detect them where they lie concealed. 'There are,' says Miller, 'in all nature and in all philosophy, certain central ideas of general bearing round which, at distances less or more remote, the subordinate and particular ideas arrange themselves.' And this was the field in which he delighted to exercise his powers. Believing in the evidences of both science and religion, he looked for, and expected to find, certain corresponding ideas underlying the truths of both. This is only bringing up abreast,

as it were, of modern discovery; the immortal argument maintained by Butler, from the 'Analogy and Course of Nature.' It is a field, however, on which the sources of error are indeed abundant — nature partially understood, — revelation erroneously interpreted, — the substitution of fanciful resemblance for real analogy.

There is a chapter in the 'Footprints' which, at least, indicates what these dangers are, if it be not an example of their effects. Miller shared in the general impression that the theory of development, in doing violence to the facts of science, did violence also, as indeed under such conditions it is sure to do, to the analogies we should expect between natural and moral truths. Thus he seems to have held that as no law of continuous progress in respect to natural capacity, but, on the contrary, a law of degeneracy — a lapse from a higher to a lower standing, had been the ruling fact in the history of man, so we may expect to find that fact reflected in other departments of creation. He was disposed to look upon the serpent 'which goes upon 'its belly' as in a literal, not merely in a figurative sense, typical, in its condition and nature, of an order of degraded beings. Ophidians were footless reptiles, — low and mutilated representatives of that mighty dynasty which had once flourished in such kingly reptiles as the *Iguanodon* and *Megalosaurus*. 'Their ill-omened birth took place when the influence of their 'house was on the wane, as if to set such a stamp of utter 'hopelessness on their fallen condition, as that set by the birth 'of a worthless or idiot heir on the fortunes of a sinking family.' In pursuance of the same idea we have this curious and ingenious remark :—

'I am disposed to regard the poison-bag of the venomous snakes as a mark of degradation, — it seems, judging from analogy, to be a protective provision of a low character exemplified chiefly in the invertebrate families, ants, centipedes, and musquitos, — spiders, wasps, and scorpions. The higher carnivora are, we find, furnished with unpoisoned weapons, which, like those of civilized man, are sufficiently effective simply from the excellence of their construction, and the power with which they are wielded, for every purpose of assault or of defence. It is only the squalid savages and degraded bushmen of Creation that have their feeble teeth or tiny stings steeped in venom, and so made formidable.' (*Footprints*, ch. ix.).

The same law of degradation might, he thought, be recognised in other instances throughout the animal kingdom. Thus, Miller never could look a flounder in the face without being seriously disquieted by that animal's personal appearance. Its twisted eyes, wry mouth, and asymmetrical arrangement of fins, were all marks of a degraded fish. Whimsical as all this

may appear, the fundamental idea is not without support from certain generalisations, as yet obscure in the history of life. Science appears so far to confirm the assertion which we have already quoted from Miller, that at least in certain classes the highest, and not the lowest, forms have been the earliest; — ‘the ‘Magnates have walked first.’ Nay more, many of the earliest forms of life appear to have united, in a single animal, peculiarities of structure which are now widely separate, characterising distinct species, and even genera. In this sense, the earliest fauna was the richest and the highest. It was the storehouse, as it were, of those organic forms which, for the purposes of adaptation, have been since distributed over a wider circle of creation. But it may justly be questioned how far this change has been really analogous to a process of degradation. The real explanation seems to be simply this,—that the fundamental law of adherence to type and pattern has been crossed, as it were, more and more by that other law of adaptation to special conditions of life, of which the structure of the flat-fish is an extreme example. On any interpretation the facts of science are equally at variance with the theory of development; and though Miller seems to have been somewhat enamoured of his idea of degradation, his purpose in following it so far appears to receive its best explanation when he says: ‘It would be ‘an easy matter for an ingenious theorist, not much disposed ‘to distinguish between the minor and the master laws of organised being, to get up quite as unexceptionable a theory of ‘degradation as of development.’

In his last work, the ‘Testimony of the Rocks,’ which has appeared as a posthumous publication, but the greater portion of which had been given to the public in the form of lectures, Miller pursues in greater detail the bearing of geological science upon natural and revealed theology, and especially upon the Mosaic account of Creation. But for his own early death, this work would have excited more controversy than has as yet actually arisen. The stricter theologians of his own country are jealous of the construction he puts upon the narrative in Genesis; whilst at least one great school of geological opinion are not less opposed to the view he takes of the discoveries of science. Yet the principles on which he proceeds are clear and intelligible enough. He condemns, on the one hand, the obstinacy or timidity of those who refuse to accept the evidences of physical truth when they interfere, or seem to do so, with traditionary interpretations of Scripture. He rejects, on the other hand, the theory that the Mosaic account of Creation is purely parable. He admits, indeed it is part of his argu-

ment to maintain, that the conveyance of spiritual truth was its primary object, and that physical facts are no farther and no otherwise revealed than as necessary for the main purpose. Nay more, he holds that the narrative is given, as it were, from a human point of view, or as the successive stages of creation might have appeared to a human eye, before which they were made to pass in vision. Thus, for example, as we speak of the nature and motion of the heavenly bodies, not as we know them to be in astronomical science, but as they appear to be from our point of sight, so he thinks that in the Mosaic account the period of their visibility is taken, as relatively to the earth, the period of their creation. But under these general principles of interpretation he holds that the sublime narrative in Genesis gives a real, though abstract and condensed view, of the order of Creation; and he challenges, as a witness to the truth of that view, the 'Testimony of the Rocks.' The abundant evidence of an ascending order in the history of Creation which that testimony affords, is the fact on which he mainly dwells; and in this his position can only be controverted by those who refuse to accept that evidence as it now stands, on the plea that it is still incomplete, that all the witnesses have not yet been sufficiently examined, and that, possibly, future researches may bring to light some whale which was playmate with the Ichthyosaurus,—great mammals which browsed on the vegetation of the Coal,—or monkeys contemporary with the Silurian fish. Even that school of geologists, however, who dwell most emphatically on the weakness of negative evidence, are prepared, we believe, to admit the crowning fact in the system of their opponents, viz., the creation, last and latest, of the human species. But the other steps in the ascending order are all in analogy with this; and, when physical evidence and analogical probability unite in favour of the same conclusion, it can hardly be denied that, in respect to this great leading idea of Creation, the discoveries of science and the narrative in Genesis are as yet in harmony with each other.

In his earlier works Miller had adopted the opinion that the 'days' of Creation might be literally understood as natural days of twenty-four hours; and that the long ages of geology might be reconciled with this view by supposing that the narrative in Genesis referred only to a creation of the existing order of things, between which and the former ages of geological time there had been a chaotic interregnum. Nothing is clearer or more manly than the account he gives of the reasons which have compelled him to relinquish this opinion,

and to hold that the 'days' of Genesis must be interpreted simply as representing long periods of time.

'The conclusion at which I have been compelled to arrive is, that for many long ages ere man was ushered into being, not a few of his humbler contemporaries of the fields and woods enjoyed life in their present haunts, and that for thousands of years anterior to even *their* appearance, many of the existing mollusks lived in our seas. That *day* during which the present creation came into being, and in which God, when he had made "the beast of the earth after his kind, and the cattle after their kind," at length terminated the work by moulding a creature in His own image, to whom he gave dominion over them all, was not a brief period of a few hours' duration, but extended over mayhap millenniums of centuries. No blank chaotic gap of death and darkness separated the creation to which man belongs from that of the old extinct elephant, hippopotamus, and hyæna; for familiar animals such as the red deer, the roe, the fox, the wild-cat, and the badger, lived throughout the period which connected their times with our own; and so I have been compelled to hold, that the days of creation were not natural, but prophetic days, and stretched far back into the bygone eternity. After in some degree committing myself to the other side, I have yielded to evidence which I found it impossible to resist; and such in this matter has been my *inconsistency*, — an inconsistency of which the world has furnished examples in all the sciences, and will, I trust, in its onward progress, continue to furnish many more.' (*Preface to the Testimony.*)

Consistently with this interpretation, Miller pursues the parallelism farther, between the natural and the written record. Geologists have in a general way divided the whole sedimentary strata of the earth into three great leading groups, with boundaries more or less indefinite at the points of junction, but clearly distinguishable from each other as a whole, by separate aspects of organic life. These are the Palæozoic, the Secondary, and the Tertiary rocks. Miller holds that in these we may trace three of the great days recorded in Genesis, the only three which refer to purely terrestrial phenomena, and consequently of which any record can be expected in the rocks. He takes the coal-measures as typical of the Palæozoic rocks — a period of marvellous vegetation, such as never had before existed, and has never existed since; and so specially representing the day when the earth 'brought forth seed after its kind.' He takes the series of the Oolites and Lias with their enormous reptiles, fluvial and marine, as equally characteristic of the Secondary ages, and so answering to the day when the 'waters brought forth abundantly,' and great sea monsters and creeping things were the most conspicuous works of creative power. Lastly, he sees in

the Tertiary deposits, with their prodigious abundance, and immense variety of Mammalian life, an epoch corresponding with wonderful truth to that day when 'cattle and beasts of the earth' indicated the approaching consummation, and prepared for the reign of Man.

It has been objected to this view that the facts do not exactly correspond with the picture—that an extraordinary development of vegetation characterised only a part of the Palæozoic strata—that creation embraced during those times, as well as during the succeeding Secondary ages, many forms of animal, and especially of Ichthyic life—that in like manner beasts of the earth had appeared before the Tertiary ages had begun—and that, consequently, no such divisions of time can be accurately applied to corresponding divisions in organic nature. It is no part of our object here to enter into the controversy which may be raised on this and other similar points. But, in justice to Miller's view, we must observe that it is founded on principles of interpretation which are not much affected by this class of objection. No one knew better than Miller that the divisions indicated in Geology are not sharp or definite, either in respect to their duration, or in respect to their productions. His own research had been specially devoted not to the plants, but to the fish of the Palæozoic rocks, and he had described, as no one else had ever described, the abundant fertility of primeval seas. But he did not consider these facts inconsistent with his view: because he holds the representation given in Genesis to be an ideal representation—but ideal only in the same sense in which the great general classifications of the naturalist or the geologist are themselves ideal. It was not to be regarded as teaching the details of physical science, but only as shadowing forth certain great leading acts in the drama of creation, and selecting a few prominent epochs as typical of the whole. The fundamental idea is that the epochs thus selected were representative of corresponding stages in the history of the earth,—stages through which it passed from one physical condition to another, each more advanced than the preceding, with reference to its final purpose. Some of these earlier epochs or days, such as that assigned to the 'Division of the Firmaments,' have left, of course, no record in Palæontology: and Miller's picture of this part of the Mosaic Vision may appear to be purely fanciful. Yet it is remarkable that conclusions derived from other branches of the science afford no small probability to his rendering. We observe in the Cambridge Essays for 1857, a very able Paper on Geology, by Professor W. Hopkins, in which, with all the care of exact reasoning, and from arguments purely physical and

cosmical, he shows the high probability of conditions in the early history of the Earth very similar to those which are assumed by Miller. Nor is it less worthy of observation that, looking at the subject from this very different point of view, he fixes on the vegetation of the Coal as by far the most striking indication of what those conditions may probably have been during part of the Palæozoic ages. Doubtless all these conclusions are scientifically more or less uncertain. They must continue to be tested by the progress of discovery. Meanwhile it may perhaps be enough to say that the theologian will recognise the principle of interpretation assumed by Miller with reference to this supposed vision of the past, as at least not wanting in analogy with that which has been long admitted with reference to visions of the future: whilst the geologist must admit that it accords at least so far with the 'Testimony of the Rocks,' as to embody a very large amount of physical truth.

Whilst we write, another posthumous work of Hugh Miller has appeared, 'The Cruise of the Betsey,' being a republication from the columns of the 'Witness,' of various papers, in which our author gives an account of visits to the Hebrides, and to several other parts of Scotland. One of Miller's earliest companions among the rocks and caves of Cromarty, making, if not a better, at least a more regular use of his opportunities, had fitted himself for the clerical profession, and had become minister of the 'Small Isles.' This gentleman cast in his lot with the seceders in the disruption of 1843; but the proprietor of the principal island of his charge, was one of those who took the course, now we rejoice to believe almost universally abandoned, of refusing a site for either church or manse. The energy of the Free Church soon found at least a partial remedy; and a yacht, provided for the purpose, afforded a home to the 'outed' minister, from which, anchored in the creeks of that indented coast, he could still preach to his people in cottages or on the open heath. The Western Isles of Scotland seem to be the broken fragments of some ancient country, which for many ages, extending from the Secondary far into the Tertiary period, had been the seat of violent and repeated volcanic action. The forces whose various operations have during those long ages determined the physical aspect of the existing world, have nowhere, in our island at least, moulded it into grander forms. Miller's descriptions in this work are as fresh, eloquent, and true as any that have ever issued from his pen. We have renewed our recollection of them with infinite pleasure, and we have little doubt that this volume will largely share in the

popularity of his other works. His account of the magnificent basaltic precipice called the 'Scur of Eigg,' as well as of that interesting island generally; and the account in a subsequent chapter of a very different scene, the forest of Darnaway and the banks of Findhorn, are characteristic specimens of his graphic power. One passage we shall venture to transcribe, both because it is an example of the genial disposition which is one great charm of his writings, and because it brings pleasantly before us the author of the 'Old Red Sandstone,' in his condition as a 'journeyman mason.' There is no more beautiful or peculiar scenery in Scotland than that of Easter Ross. Rich corn lands, bearing wheat which will frequently compare with that grown on the Weald of Sussex, lean against a Highland country whose long valleys still retain remnants of the Scotch fir-forests which once covered the country, and are the bed of rivers whose 'rejoicing streams' invite to nobler sport than old Isaac ever dreamed of. In this district Miller had spent some of his earliest and his hardest days of manual labour. And in the eighth chapter of this last work, we have this pleasant account of a revisit after the lapse of some five-and-twenty years.

'After enjoying a magnificent sunset on the banks of the Conon, just where the scenery, exquisite throughout, is most delightful, I returned through the woods, and spent half an hour by the way in the cottage of a kindly-hearted woman, now considerably advanced in years, whom I had known, when she was in middle life, as the wife of one of the Conon-side hands, and who not unfrequently when I was toiling at the mallet in the burning sun, hot and thirsty, and rather loosely knit for my work, had brought me—all she had to offer at the time—a draught of whey. At first she seemed to have wholly forgotten both her kindness and the object of it. She well remembered my master, and another Cromarty man, who had been grievously injured when undermining an old building, by the sudden fall of the erection; but she could bethink her of no third Cromarty man whatever. "Eh, sirs!" she at length exclaimed, "I darsay ye'll be just the sma' prentice laddie. Weel, what will young folk no come out o'? They were maist a' stout big men at the wark except yoursel', an' you're now stouter and bigger than maist o' them. Eh, sirs! an' are ye still a mason?" Once fairly entered on our talk together, we gossiped on till the night fell, giving and receiving information regarding our old acquaintances of a quarter of a century before, of whom we found that no inconsiderable proportion had already sunk in the stream in which we must all eventually disappear.'

We have left ourselves no space for any farther notice of other portions of our author's writings, which are, perhaps, of equal interest, and less specially connected with his favourite science. The dramatic power of the narrative of his own life

in 'My Schools and Schoolmasters,' must be felt by all who have read that most delightful production of his pen. In this, as well as in the 'First Impressions of England and its People,' we meet at every turn with fresh and happy thoughts on a multitude of questions of literary, political, and social interest, some of which we had marked for extract, but which for the present, at least, we must leave unnoticed. Hugh Miller must, undoubtedly, be regarded as one of the most remarkable men whom Scotland has produced. He was not lifted, like Burns, the Ettrick Shepherd, and others, by the gift of poetry, out of the class to which he originally belonged. He rose from it by the help, no doubt, of great natural powers, but in an equal degree by careful study and assiduous self-culture. And so complete was his rise, that in reading his works, we cease altogether to think of his origin, and fail to recognise the peculiarities of any class whatever. There is nothing in them of a merely local character, or which reminds us that they are the production of provincial genius. The elements of national character are, indeed, strongly marked, but they are subordinate to the wider sympathies which belong to the commonwealth of cultivated minds. The working men of his native country may well be proud of such a representative in the literature of England.

ART. II. — *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, faisant suite à l'Histoire de la Révolution Française.* Par M. A. THIERS. 17 vols. Paris: 1845—1858.

[PART THE SECOND.]

IN the inquiry into the fidelity of M. Thiers' history, commenced in our preceding Number, it was our chief aim to deal with such questions as we conceived to involve the honour of the British Government and the glory of the British arms. We endeavoured to point out — while we acknowledged the genius and admired the patriotism of the writer — salient instances in which his judgment had been misled by predilection, by haste, and by defective research. We maintained our positions by documentary evidence of the first authority in our own language; and we borrowed from French records an auxiliary aid which the industry of M. Thiers had failed to exhaust. It now remains to diverge to transactions less exclusively connected with Great Britain, to glance at the author's view of the domestic institutions of the Empire, and to trace to the catastrophe of Leipsic the latest irruption of the French legions beyond the banks of the Rhine.

We resume this inquiry at the culminating point to which the French Empire had been raised in 1809, by the illimitable ambition of its chief, and the inexhaustible ardour of a nation of warriors. The immense structure which was now developed beyond the limits of Consular France had been built within four years, upon the four cardinal victories of Austerlitz, of Jena, of Friedland, and of Wagram. An absolute dominion had been established by land, and the coast-line of Europe marked out the sway of the standard of France from that of the flag of Great Britain. Our own nation, in one corner of Europe, was maintaining a doubtful military struggle with Napoleon against tenfold odds; but which served afterwards to inspire Germany and to free Spain. The nearly universal peace which was now the policy of the Empire, was simply the surrender of Europe to a nearly universal oppression. Prussia was directly ruled by French bayonets; Austria sank in equal thrall under a dynastic alliance; Russia still yielded to a — which violated her commercial interests; the Rhenish federation had dismembered Germany; German electors were debased into French lieutenants; the Seven Provinces were annexed to France; Rome became her second capital; the Pontifical itself shrank into an imperial chaplaincy; at Milan

Eugene Beauharnois exercised the powers of the iron crown ; in the North the traditionary glory of the Hanse Towns was shrouded in a French commercial blockade, and at Naples a Marshal of France filled the throne of the Angevine kings. This magnificent creation was no triumph of Cæsar or Charlemagne over barbarous tribes ; it was a triumph over empires defended by laws and by morals, as well as by patriotism and by religion. But it was a dominion, again, which depended on a choice of the right moment for a cavalry charge. It pursued the arts of war to the exclusion of the arts of peace ; and even where peace was nominally established, its blessings were withheld, and its laws were subjected to the harsh exigencies of universal warfare, until even the means of carrying on war were exhausted by the measures taken to prolong it. Take, for example, the Continental System of Napoleon, as a chief instance of the administrative impolicy which destroyed his power.

It is but a justice to the author to quote, in the first place, his criticism on the politics of the French Empire in this juncture :—

‘ If,’ says M. Thiers, ‘ Napoleon had applied himself to obtain from his recent marriage the advantages it might have offered, by reassuring Austria and by holding out to her at least the hope of recovering the Illyrian provinces, useless to himself, as the price of a sincere alliance ; if he had appeased Germany by a complete evacuation ; if he had restricted instead of extending his continual annexations to the Empire ; if while he was labouring to render the continental blockade more strict, he had not made it a pretext for fresh encroachment ; if he had conveyed to Spain an overwhelming mass of forces, and above all the greatest of his forces—his own presence ; if he had renounced every other war till that was ended ; if he had subjected England to such reverses in the Peninsula that she would have been compelled to make peace ; if he had continued to respect the religious opinions he had flattered in earlier years, by bringing Pius VII. to an arrangement which that pontiff desired in his heart : if whilst he thus secured the establishment of the Empire by a general peace, he had known how to grant some measures of freedom to minds about to crave for it, it was possible to prevent a great catastrophe, or at least to prolong the existence of the exorbitant structure he had raised.

‘ He himself seems after the victory of Wagram and his alliance with the blood of the Cæsars, to have been struck by this reflection, and upon his return to Paris he appeared altogether occupied with the task of reassuring Europe, of appeasing Germany, of finishing the Spanish war, of disarming or conquering England, of sparing the finances of France, of terminating the religious disputes, and of restoring tranquillity to a world exhausted with fatigue. Unhappily he set about the solution of these difficulties in the same

spirit in which he had created them; instead of untying the knot, he sought to break it, and thenceforward his genius, still as vast as ever, ceased to be fortunate and seemed to have ceased to be able.' (Vol. xii. p. 7, 8.)

In this and in many other passages of his later volumes, M. Thiers points out and deplores the temerity which led Napoleon to throw aside the last opportunities of peace, and to spurn the counsels of moderation. But he appears not to perceive that the fundamental conditions on which the government of Napoleon rested, both abroad and at home, were absolutely opposed to measures of conciliation, and that the burden laid upon the nearest allies of France was so intolerable, that such a state of subjection could only end in the reaction of universal hostility.

At this very time, under the name of peace, the strictest commercial blockade was exacted from every State which maintained amicable relations with Napoleon. The Continental System was in fact an armed occupation of Europe, for it involved the absolute submission of allies and neutrals to the most barbarous system of mercantile prohibition which had ever been invented to aggravate the horrors of war, even upon those who were not directly engaged in it. All the resources of Napoleon's power and intellect were directed to maintain it. To this phantasm he sacrificed the honour of his own brother in Holland, the alliance of Russia, and the last elements of prosperity in France. It was the most comprehensive conception of his reign; it was the most fixed of his political ideas; and it was the worst error of his administration.

M. Thiers is, nevertheless, a strenuous champion of this system. He still clings with desperate tenacity to all those venerable illusions of commercial policy that have been exploded by the progress of Political Economy; he miscalculates the impression produced by the blockade on the resources of Great Britain; and he underrates the fatal results — both social and political — which recoiled upon its authors. His defence of the Continental System, in his twelfth volume, evolves three leading propositions, — that this system was an instance of the original thought of Napoleon, — that it was an act of just retaliation on the commercial laws of this country, — and that it was wise and expedient as a principle of commerce. We shall attempt to show that each of these positions is untrue.

It is a mistake to suppose that the principle of the Continental System originated with Napoleon. The prevalence of such an error is less surprising, than that it should extend to the accomplished vindicator of the French Empire. He de-

scribes everywhere the design *de vaincre la mer par la terre*, as a 'gigantic flea,' and 'the idea of Napoleon.' Now it happens that this principle was the principle of the Directory. It was pursued by them, with at least equal rigour, wherever their dominion extended.

If we refer to their barbarous decree of the 18th of January, 1798, we find it provided that every ship should be condemned with *any* English merchandise on board, whoever were its proprietors,—that the shipment of such merchandise from Great Britain, or its dependencies, should render it contraband,—that French harbours should be closed against all ships, not in actual distress, which had touched at British ports,—and 'that neutral sailors found in British ships should be put to death.' The chief difference between this decree and the decrees of Berlin and of Milan lies in the extent of their application. But in both, the principle was asserted wherever the authority of the State extended. This law was revoked by the Consulate, and was substantially re-enacted by the Empire in terms of nearly equal severity. The decrees of Berlin re-introduced an exploded fallacy; and their Imperial author went forth as the champion of a false political economy, to deliver battle to Europe for a commercial blunder.

M. Thiers' next view of the Continental System, as the just retaliation of France on the commercial laws of England, is little less than an illogical anachronism. He represents the decrees of Napoleon from Berlin, of 1806, which organised the Continental blockade, as a retaliation on the British Order in Council which had announced the blockade of the French ports between Brest and the Elbe; but he forgets that the British Order in Council was itself a retaliation on the earlier decrees of Napoleon. 'This incredible violation of public law,' writes M. Thiers of our Order in Council, 'furnished Napoleon with a just pretext for adopting the most rigorous measures in respect of English commerce. He conceived a formidable decree which, altogether excessive as it might appear, was but a just compensation for the violence of England.'*

But this 'violence of England' did no more than reciprocate the French decree of 1803, which had closed the Elbe and the Weser against British merchandise, after the illegal seizure of Hamburg and Bremen, and the conquest of Hanover in defiance of its constitutional disconnexion from the British Government. Even by the Treaty of Foligno, concluded between France and the Two Sicilies, on the 9th of Fe-

bruary, 1801, the Neapolitan and Sicilian ports had been closed against British merchant ships. M. Thiers, therefore, mistakes an act of retaliation for an act of aggression; and if British ships were expelled from neutral ports, it was just that neutral ships should be excluded from French ports.

We pass, therefore, to the third question — Was the Continental System a failure or a success?

The chief principle on which this system was maintained rested on the assumption that it was essential to the subjugation of England, and that the subjugation of England was essential to the subjugation of the Continent. The maritime policy of Napoleon was founded, as we have said, on a system of auxiliary alliances, even more consistently than the policy of England was founded on a system of territorial alliances. When the result of Trafalgar destroyed his hope of subduing British influence on the Continent by naval superiority, he attempted to divert that influence by peace; and, when he had abandoned negotiation, he revived his policy of maritime alliances. As his power over the sea-board of Europe was greater than his power by sea, his means of naval operation declined, but his commercial warfare increased in scope and organisation on land. The application of the Continental System to French domestic interests was so subordinate, and its impolicy in that respect was so soon acknowledged by Napoleon himself, that it has no claim to notice as a protective law.

Here is M. Thiers' *exposé* of this system: —

'Yet Napoleon, in persisting in his system, in watching the shores of France and of the countries in alliance with her, in daily reading the accounts of the entering and clearing of ships, in requiring the introduction of French custom-houses and troops in Holland, in committing to Marshal Davout the charge of guarding Bremen, Hamburg, and Lubeck, in himself preparing for the reoccupation of Swedish Pomerania, in forcing Prussia to shut Colberg and Königsberg, in pressing Russia, without however pushing her to extremities, to shut Riga and St. Petersburg, was near the accomplishment of great results. No doubt there might remain some issues half-open to the produce of British industry; but these products, compelled to ascend in ships to the extremities of the North, and then to redescend in Russian waggons to the South, would arrive at the places of consumption charged with such heavy expenses that their sale would be impossible. The Continental System, thus practised, if it were perseveringly maintained, but also without provoking a war with the North, could not fail, as we shall see presently, to bring Great Britain to a state of unendurable distress.' (Vol. xii. pp. 57, 58.)

The best commentary on this theory of prohibition is to be found in the introduction, and eventually in the general use, of

a system of imperial Licences, by which Napoleon authorised the evasion of his own laws. This failure was the consequence, first of its defective operation, and secondly of the suffering which it produced on the Continent.

Its defective operation resulted partly from the trade maintained between England and the countries which it could not reach, and partly from its inefficiency in practice, even where it was nominally established. M. Thiers is in total error when he speaks of the North as the only quarter into which British produce could be introduced. Our trade with the Continent was also maintained through Spain and through Turkey. France could not guard the Peninsular coasts; and those who know the extent of contraband trade which passes through the Pyrenees, even now that the French ports are open, will acknowledge that our trade cannot have been greatly injured in the South-west. The treaty of January, 1809, re-established our trade with Turkey; and the ukase of the 31st of December, 1810, admitted colonial produce into Russia under a neutral flag. Through Turkey our commerce passed into Austria, and through the North it descended into the rest of Germany.

The inefficacy of the system, even in the countries into which it was introduced, is acknowledged, with some reservation, by M. Thiers himself. In Holland it was impracticable, he tells us, from the physical configuration of the country. Napoleon discovered that he had committed a blunder equally gigantic and absurd. He might be injuring England—he might be injuring the States subordinate to his empire—but he was ruining France. The social necessity, which was more imperious than the political prohibition, had created an immense contraband trade. Napoleon had beggared the State, to give rise to an enormous monopoly too illicit to be endured and too intangible to be suppressed. The smugglers defied his fiscal laws, nullified his foreign policy, and appropriated his natural revenues. It was simply a question whether this source of wealth should be theirs or his. The solution was obvious, and the principle of Licences arose.

Meanwhile, as the Continental System was more rigidly enforced in France than in any other country (excepting where the army of Davout was fully established), it followed that contraband goods were sold dearer in France than elsewhere, and increased in price with the cost of transport through each district that they traversed from the place of importation. It followed, also, that Napoleon had thrown the gain and loss of France into inverse scales with the gain and loss of England.

For France simply obtained an interchange of goods with England at the highest prices, in recompense for the interchange of goods between England and nearly every other country at lower prices. Napoleon handled a two-edged sword, and he had turned the keener blade upon himself.

It is stated by M. Thiers that the system of licences originated with this country, under a scarcity of corn. That, however, was a temporary object. On either side, indeed, the commercial laws of war were an evil and a blunder; and the sufferings which undoubtedly were felt by this country, arose just as much from the imprudent violence of our own retaliatory measures, as from the measures of the enemy. The wiser policy of the present day would probably seek to counteract such measures, not by retaliation, but by throwing open our ports to the whole world. The system of licences, which was introduced in the very midst of the Continental System, was, in fact, a recognition of the very principles which that system set at naught.

Yet, with singular absurdity, M. Thiers declares, 'Nevertheless the result which Napoleon really did obtain, was, by means of great violence but of great efficacy, to strike a great blow at British credit, by lowering the prices of all the commodities which served as a guarantee for the paper of the Bank of England!'

But the licences thus issued by France and England involved a yet more unequal reciprocity. They were sold by France at a charge equal to the computed cost of contraband traffic, in order to divert the monopoly to the State. But the French licences, which were subject to an obligation to export French produce at a corresponding value, were evaded by purchases at fictitious prices, and the manufactures thus bought were thrown into the sea. The decrees of Trianon of the 5th of August, 1810, applied these licences to British colonial goods; and a subsequent decree of the same year extended their operation without reserve. The Continental System, therefore, virtually expired within four years after the famous decrees of Berlin. From that time it ceased to be an engine of war, and became simply a measure of revenue. Here is the best evidence of its failure as an offensive weapon.

M. Thiers passes very lightly over the suffering which this system produced. He does not so much as describe the difficulties in which it involved the French Government, or the change which it introduced into French manners. He tells us that the expenditure exceeded the revenue by forty million

francs in peace, and by a hundred million francs in war. Elsewhere he contrasts the increase of French debt with the increase of the English debt, to the advantage of his own country. But he forgets that while we drew an English revenue for a European expenditure, France drew a European income for a French expenditure. It was frequently our principle of war to subsidise our allies: it was invariably the French principle of war to levy contributions on the States whose armies France had defeated in the field.

M. Mollien's admirable memoirs furnish authentic and conclusive evidence that the financial difficulties of the French Empire were often nearly overwhelming. Indeed, an imperial soldier of fortune, whose glory was his title, and whose trophies were the monuments of his glory, must have been in sad distress when he sold back to Austria the cannon he had taken on the field of Austerlitz. The fact is asserted by Hardenberg, the most credible annalist of the German war. French customs underwent a similar change. Ladies wore cotton dresses, which were most fashionable because they were most dear, and coffee was sipped as an Olympian nectar.

The impolicy of the Continental System is best illustrated by the misery which it produced, and the atrocities by which it was maintained. Those cities which were most obnoxious to its influence became vast societies of paupers. Wherever the population had been dependent on a comparatively free commerce, the suffering was intense. Hardenberg tells us that 'at Rome (during the maintenance of this system) there were computed to be 30,000 paupers out of a population of 100,000, that at Amsterdam there were 80,000 out of 217,000, and that at Venice there were 70,000 out of only 100,000.'* The Continental System thus sufficed to cripple the commercial energies of the French Empire without materially injuring the wealth of England.

Meanwhile death was the penalty of a violation of the French custom laws. Fathers of families were shot for the possession of the most valueless goods in contraband, and the fortresses of the Elbe were crammed with those whom the decline of trade had disabled from paying the heavy imposts levied by France in the North of Germany. No empire, then, was ever before so impolitic or lived so fast. No other empire so rapidly destroyed its own elasticity, and stimulated reaction against its power. No other empire was ever misruled by so rancorous a protectionist and so rapacious a financier.

* *Mémoires d'un Homme d'État*, vol. xi. p. 253.

The Continental System, then, was a universal blunder. It was a blunder as a means of offensive war. It was a blunder because it injured the French Empire more than it injured the other Continental States. It was a blunder because it injured France more than it injured England. It was a blunder from the absurd abuses of its licences, under which French goods were bought at nominal prices, thrown overboard and not exchanged. Above all, it was a blunder from the spirit of discontent and hostility to France which it kept alive throughout Europe.

We will take one other instance of M. Thiers' treatment of the policy of Napoleon in the period to which we have just alluded. It arises out of the marriage of the Emperor with Maria Louisa, and it throws a new and still more unfavourable light on the circumstances which attended the dissolution of his former marriage. The 'religious marriage' of Josephine is described in the *fifth* volume: her divorce in the *eleventh*.

In the former of these passages, the author tells us that when the Pope arrived at Paris to crown Napoleon, Josephine privately informed him that in consequence of the interdiction of the ceremonies of the Church at the period of her marriage with Bonaparte, that marriage had simply been a civil ceremony. M. Thiers ascribes this communication solely to religious motives, and not to that of improving her position as a wife and an empress. The Pope, scandalized by the intelligence, declared to Napoleon that he would not crown her while she remained in a state of concubinage. Napoleon was enraged with Josephine; the programme of the ceremony for the coronation had been made public; the day was imminent; the Pontiff was inexorable; and Josephine was resolute. At length then, as we are informed in this remarkable passage, the Emperor, overcome jointly by the Pontiff and his own wife, was privately married to Josephine by Cardinal Fesch, in the chapel of the Tuileries, on the night preceding the coronation. That the ceremony might be in form, Berthier and Talleyrand were introduced as witnesses. Josephine was content. Her marriage had been civil, religious, and regular; and she experienced, no doubt, the supreme felicity of a woman who has achieved a little triumph over the other sex. This is the testimony of the fifth volume.

We now turn to the divorce narrated in the eleventh volume. Napoleon, who never spared a deception where he could secure an end, had the effrontery, in 1810, to deal with this marriage simply as a civil contract. At length Cardinal Fesch, scan-

dalized in turn, mentioned to Cambacérès the secret of the coronation eve. Napoleon was furious with the Cardinal, as he had before been furious with Josephine. The Emperor and M. Thiers are here thrown into equal difficulty, and they cut the knot by a similar expedient. The former declared the marriage to be void for the absence of witnesses; and the latter discovers the authority for the statement in his fifth volume to be false; and the marriage vanishes for want of formality.

The balance of probability inclines against this later story. M. Thiers states that his authority for the presence of Talleyrand and Berthier is a contemporary writer who had the statement from the lips of Josephine. His subsequent perusal of state papers convinces him that this is an error. Now we have seen that Napoleon had already practised deep deception on this very question. It is likely, therefore, that he would not be defeated by scruples. Talleyrand was hardly more veracious than himself, and Fesch was prepared to counsel the annulling of a rite which his Church taught him to be sacramental, even if it were informal. If, then, it were determined to solve this difficulty by falsehood, it is clear that all the correspondence between the Government and the bishops would be based on the assertion of an untruth. For these reasons the state papers are of no authority on this question.

The story as adopted by M. Thiers in the later portion of his narrative, bears strong evidence of invention. Napoleon declared at length that he had foreseen the revocation of the marriage in 1804, and had therefore taken care that it should be so performed as to appease the Pope and Josephine, and yet be so informal as to be invalid. The dilemma of duplicity is not enviable. Either the assertion was false or he had deliberately deceived his wife during successive years. But what is more improbable than all is that, even if Cardinal Fesch had been corrupted into the celebration of an invalid marriage, the Pope himself should have crowned Josephine until he had been satisfied of its formality.

We have not the space to follow M. Thiers through other chapters which refer simply to the domestic history of the French Empire. It may be well, however; to suggest this general rule for their perusal: that where they do not clash with the strong prepossessions of the author, they may be trusted for their accuracy and their justice. The chapter, for instance, on the Concordat has not been marred by preconceptions: it is equally masterly in treatment and learned in research. The liberal and enlightened opinions of the writer

are expressed with all his force and lucidity, and his usual bias for his hero is often lost in the justice of his panegyric.

We now turn to what we have described as the fourth period of this history — the German events of 1813. Those events were obviously but the immediate result of the campaign of Moscow, which had set loose throughout Germany a spirit of fierce reaction against the intolerable arrogance and oppression of the French in preceding years. One of the clearest evidences of this truth is to be found in the fact that the conditions of peace held out by the Allies in 1813 were more inexorable on the suppression of the Continental System than on any other question.

The German events of 1813 present three distinct periods — the Russo-Prussian war with France, marked chiefly by the battles of Lutzen and Bautzen — the armistice — and the campaigns of Dresden and Leipsic. We shall follow M. Thiers through each of these periods.

In spite of the tremendous reverses of the preceding year, the policy of Napoleon, when he once more crossed the Rhine in 1813, was never more arrogant and rapacious, never probably less hazardous to himself. He had never but in Russia taken the field with so great a superiority in numbers. He had never encountered enemies who based their operations on greater strategic blunders. He never encountered enemies equally disorganised in point of military command; and the grand coalition, on which rested the future deliverance of Europe, was still unformed. Against these advantages of number, of situation, of strategy, and of discipline, he had no other inferiority to sustain than the inexperience and extreme youth of many of his troops. What is chiefly surprising is, that the Russian and Prussian armies were not destroyed before Austria and Sweden came into the field. Even after the armistice, which divided the campaign of Lutzen from that of Dresden, it may be doubted whether the altered situation of Napoleon necessarily involved equal perils with those which he had surmounted in the campaigns of Italy, of Austerlitz, and of Wagram.

The criticism of M. Thiers on the rashness of the allied armies, in the spring of 1813, is perfectly just. Immediately before the opening of the campaign they had, he observes, but 110,000 men in the field. Even this computation is probably above the true one. The whole force of the Allies beyond the Elbe is estimated by General Cathcart at 100,000, and by Lord Londonderry at 85,000. 'This,' writes M. Thiers, 'was not much for so much hardihood, for so much presumption, for such mag-

‘nificent promises published throughout Europe, in order to raise ‘her against us.’ While the Allies were unprepared to maintain their exposed position, Napoleon suddenly crossed the Rhine in immense force before the middle of April, and fought two pitched battles, which compelled them to retreat from the heart of Germany to the frontier of Poland. The equipment of this army within a few months after the apparent destruction of his power, is the most striking instance of Napoleon’s genius in military administration.

The strategy of the Allies in these movements is freely criticised both by Lord Londonderry and Sir G. Cathcart. By their advance into the middle of Germany, they lost in tactics what they gained in policy. It is true that, if they had been victorious, the French must have recrossed the Rhine; but it is also true that, if defeated, their own nearest base of operations was the Niemen. The further they advanced, the more they shortened the French communications and lengthened their own. The retreat of Napoleon might be supported by the fortress of Magdeburg, and masked by the Thuringian forests; but the Allies had no other retreat upon their base than across the bridges of Dresden and Meissen. They had left nearly all the strong fortresses in their rear in the hands of the French; while the French, supported by two lines of German fortresses, advanced in immense superiority of numbers. When the shock of battle came, the Allies quitted the plain, where their superior cavalry would have found scope, to fight in villages defended by masked batteries of the French.

The policy which dictated these strategic blunders was obviously that of rousing Germany, of defending Prussia, and of influencing Austria. There had also been great miscalculation. The new French army was underrated in numbers. It was unreasonably depreciated in the public estimation of its military spirit. ‘*Que feront nous de ces cochons de lait ?*’ they had heard that a French general had exclaimed when he saw the levies of Napoleon. A Swedish army had also been expected. That the advance of the Allies was dictated by political motives, appears more clearly in the fact that it was strongly opposed at headquarters; where it was urged that, at any rate, the army should be formed into a defensive camp on the Elbe, between the fortresses of Wittenburg and Torgau, until reinforcements had arrived. The decision of the sovereigns overruled the commanders and out-generated the army.

The battle of Lutzen is described by M. Thiers in a characteristic manner. He claims victory for Napoleon on the very ground on which he asserts, in a former volume, that Wel-

lington could *not* claim victory at Fuentes Onoro. 'The Prussians, however,' he writes derisively, 'apparently quite giddy with having made head against Napoleon, had the courage to write everywhere, especially to Vienna, that they had obtained a real victory, and that, if they retired, it was for want of ammunition, and from mere military strategy!'^{*} Now it happens that this retreat for want of ammunition is the very ground on which M. Thiers has exonerated Massena from the charge of defeat at Fuentes Onoro. The incidents were in other respects so parallel, that if Wellington was not victor at Fuentes Onoro, Napoleon was certainly not victor at Lutzen.†

It is clear that the only strategic success that influenced the retreat of the Allies from Lutzen was disconnected from the battle itself. This was the intelligence that Lauriston had forced Kleist to surrender Leipsic. The contest had been maintained under a great numerical inequality. The Allies at its close had but 70,000 on the field; and the French who, if inferior in discipline, were superior in position, had 120,000. The Allies lost 10,000 in the action, according to Cathcart, not 20,000; while M. Thiers estimates the French loss at 17,000. Lord Londonderry adds, that the Allies took several guns, and did not lose one. The retreat from Lutzen, therefore, arose rather from false strategy in the plan of the campaign, and the want of ammunition in the action itself, than from the worsting of the Allies by the French.

The armistice itself was brought about by a combination of military tactics with a master-stroke of policy, which M. Thiers ascribes to the Emperor Alexander. The demoralisation of the Allied army during a long retreat and after another general action at Bautzen, decisive only in the surrender of territory which it involved, reduced the Allies to the alternative of arresting hostilities or of retreating into Poland. Barclay de Tolly, the commander-in-chief, maintained that, if the Russians were not withdrawn from Germany, the whole army would be dissipated. Alexander, on the other hand, saw plainly that, if they retired into Poland, the European Confederacy was dissolved. In this difficulty, the Allies threw up their communications with Poland, abandoned the road to Breslau, and took position in the camp of

^{*} Vol. xvi. p. 491.

† If M. Thiers had read Cathcart's Commentaries, he would have known that the retreat from Lutzen for want of ammunition, which he does not choose apparently to believe, was a fact. The Emperor Alexander stated this to the then Lord Cathcart immediately after the action.

the Great Frederic at Schweidnitz; on the Bohemian frontier. They exchanged, therefore, the base of Poland for the base of Bohemia; and if Napoleon pursued the war, he could pursue it only in the Austrian territories. There can be no doubt that it was as fully understood by the Allies, as it was believed by Napoleon also, that Austria, if forced to declare herself, would declare for their cause.* From this moment, therefore, a suspension of hostilities without a retreat was achieved. Austria desired to gain time, Napoleon to avoid war with Austria. M. de Nesselrode was sent to Vienna, an allied flag of truce to the camp of Napoleon, and the armistice of Pleiswitz was signed on the 4th of June.

M. Thiers thus criticises the conduct of Napoleon in accepting this armistice:—

‘Such was this deplorable armistice, which it was certainly necessary to accept, if peace was desired, but to reject absolutely if peace were not the object, for it was of more importance in this case to complete the ruin of the Allies on the spot; yet Napoleon, on the contrary, accepted it precisely because he was opposed to this peace, and desired to gain two months to complete his arrangements, and to be in position to refuse the conditions of Austria!’ (Vol. xv. p. 602.)

This criticism of the policy of Napoleon is a criticism not on moral but on political grounds; and on those grounds its justice may be gravely doubted. There were two questions to be solved. Was Napoleon, who had rapidly advanced to a distance of five hundred miles from his base, in a condition to encounter immediate war in the Austrian territories, and against the Austrian army in combination with an army which he had but indecisively defeated in two general actions, which could defend the Bohemian passes, and which could retrieve its disorganisation when supplied by a friendly army in a friendly State? And was it probable that Napoleon or that the Allies would gain most largely by two months of preparation?

The former point remained a matter of opinion, the latter became a matter of fact. The truth is, that the criticism of M. Thiers is founded on an enormous miscalculation of the numbers which the Allies brought into the field on the resumption of hostilities. He represents Napoleon as greatly outnumbered in the campaigns of Dresden and of Leipsic; and no illusion probably was more common before the publication of General Cathcart's Commentaries. It is now clear that the

* Sir Charles Stewart (Lord Londonderry) wrote to Lord Castlereagh that this position had been taken in a firm reliance upon Austria. (*Castlereagh Correspondence*.)

calculation of Napoleon was so far accurate, that the force which he had brought into the field at the close of the armistice was larger by nearly one-third than that of the Allies. This mistake has arisen from a confusion between the allied army on paper and the allied army in reality. Cathcart, who speaks with the authority of a soldier present in eight general actions of that period, asserts that Austria never brought more than 50,000 men into the field at any one time during the campaigns of 1813 and 1814. The Austrian Government throughout the negotiation maintained a paper army on a sliding scale: they raised and depressed its fictitious numbers according to the convenience of the hour.

It will have been perceived that this has a direct bearing upon the judgment and ability of Napoleon himself. It has been commonly said that he was at this time infatuated by his arrogance; and that his success had compromised his perceptions. That he was both ruining France and rousing Europe to an internecine war, which first or last must have destroyed his power, there can be no doubt.

But we have been too prone to try individual wisdom by the event, to perceive that Napoleon acted upon a calm view of the probable issue of a resumption of hostilities. That his resolution was based as much upon calculation as upon passion may be presumed from his interruption of Prince Metternich at Dresden, declaring that he had spies throughout the Austrian Empire, and had ascertained that Austria had not 100,000 troops in Bohemia. The 400,000 which he brought into the field against 300,000 of the Allies, was a proportion which probably more than countervailed the physical inferiority of his men. The gallantry of his German troops justified, perhaps, an imperfect appreciation of the patriotism of Prussia. His calculation of blunders in the allied command was founded on the experience of Lutzen, and was justified by the result of Dresden. Whatever might be the ability of the French generals who had been brought over to the allied camp, it is clear that the advice of Moreau was long rejected by the grand army, and that the allied cause was simply injured by the duplicity of Bernadotte in the movements of the campaign.

It is certainly an anomaly to charge M. Thiers with injustice towards his own hero. But Napoleon rarely possessed a fairer probability of success in all its intrinsic conditions. That his expectations were defeated was the result, as General Cathcart acknowledges, of the one pervading blunder on which his whole strategy was based. We shall attempt to indicate that blunder in its place. Still we believe that, but for the genius

of Blücher and the achievements of his Silesian army, all would have struggled in vain.

Bernadotte was essentially a trimmer. While he joined the combination against Napoleon, he took care to avoid direct conflict with the imperial arms, which might compromise his popularity in France. He had no great zeal for the freedom of Europe, but he had much ambition for the French diadem. This ambition was the spring of his whole conduct. When in command of the army of the North, he left his Russian and Prussian divisions to encounter the French troops, and kept his Swedish force carefully in the rear. He even endeavoured, by every artifice, to avoid a participation in the battle of Leipsic. He became equally a mark for keen satire and indignant remonstrance from allied diplomatists and allied generals. But the bitterest sarcasm of all came from Dufresse, the French commander at Stettin. During the armistice, the troops of Bernadotte were encamped around this fortress. On one occasion a shot passed near the Prince Royal of Sweden, as he was riding by its walls. He despatched his aides-de-camp with magnificent expostulations to the French general. 'Ce n'est rien,' replied Dufresse, with inimitable irony, 'la grand' garde a aperçu un déserteur, et a tiré dessus!'

The manner in which M. Thiers paints the rapacity, the selfishness, the cruelty, the falsehood, and the arrogance of Napoleon, during this armistice, cannot be surpassed in justice or in power. It has the exciting interest of fiction and the vivid reality of life. The capacity of the author for the portraiture of individual character is that talent which supplies the clear impress that years of personal intimacy might not afford—which makes the soul live as it were in writing as it never yet lived on canvass. His sixteenth volume is beyond comparison his ablest. It is not less remarkable that in this description M. Thiers flings away all his prepossessions. No civilised man indeed could palliate, few civilised men could record without abhorrence, the deliberate resolve of a chief to sacrifice all Europe to his isolated will,—France not less than Germany, and his very generals and courtiers not less than France,—to destroy the life of hundreds of thousands in a murderous cause, in which every man but himself had ceased to share,—to exert the giant organisation of his empire in a final effort to enslave Europe before it fell,—and to mask meanwhile preconcerted crime in perfidy and in falsehood, itself more degrading than any loss of empire.

M. Thiers assures us that his delineation of this phasis of

Napoleon's character is drawn from the French archives, and from the personal testimony of Prince Metternich. It may be doubted, however, whether the author is here as much in advance of other historians in point of actual information as of descriptive power. M. Capéfigue, at least, has already claimed credence and originality for his treatment of this passage of history, on the very ground of the communications made to him by M. de Metternich. It must be assumed that the Prince had already disposed of a large share of his materials before M. Thiers began to write.

Falsehood, cruelty, and vindictiveness now became the main spring of Napoleon's policy. His first intention, on his reestablishment in Dresden was, to shoot all the members of the senate of Hamburg, those officers of the Hanseatic legion who were suspected of having incited insurrection there, and many others; to arrest and confiscate the property of 500 principal merchants; and to burn all British and colonial goods which had been imported into Hamburg under a recent infraction of his commercial system. These barbarous orders, which were committed to Marshal Davout, were happily for the most part left unexecuted. But they indicate not only the Asiatic ferocity and the Italian vindictiveness which pervaded the character of Napoleon at this crisis, but the errors of military and diplomatic administration into which he was momentarily thrown by his passions. Nothing, in truth, could have served his ends more fully than the impolitic insurrection at Hamburg. If he had seized the advantage, he would have tolerated the overthrow of his Continental System in that quarter, and at once have gained credit for a moderation which would have masked his policy, and have furnished immense supplies for his army on the Elbe.

But while he terrified weak enemies, he studied to deceive all whom he could not terrify. He reduced duplicity to a system. He signed the armistice of Pleiſwitz with the firm resolution of denouncing it at the last moment, and of suddenly attacking the allied armies when unprepared for resistance. He concealed his designs from nearly every one of his generals and statesmen. He concealed from them even the conditions of the Austrian mediation. So great was the apprehension of discontent in his army, that after grossly distorting the conditions of peace offered by the Allies, he still found it necessary to disguise his intentions. He succeeded in entirely deceiving his arch-chancellor Cambacérès. Maret, Duke of Bassano, who conducted the negotiation with the Allies, was his only con-

fidant. In order to gain a third month's suspension of arms, he feigned for the moment earnest negotiation.

His daily life at the Marcolini Palace at Dresden was dictated by the same duplicity. Under a guise of ease and dissipation, which intimated that peace was a *fait accompli*, he worked as perhaps neither general nor statesman ever worked before. He transported the French Comedy from Paris, and wrote to Cambacérès, 'Il est bon qu'on croie que nous nous amusions ici!' Mornings were passed in reviews and manœuvres, and evenings in dinners, in receptions, and the theatre. Meanwhile Napoleon, with his maps of many-coloured pins, was daily exhausting on paper the movements or combinations that might arise in the war he was about to resume. He was amassing enormous supplies upon the Elbe, and accumulating provisions in Dresden itself which should feed 300,000 men during two months. He was gathering troops and levying recruits from every quarter of his empire. He rode or drove often for forty or fifty miles a day to inspect the works which he had ordered to strengthen his base on the Elbe. For public business, as well as for public show, Dresden became the capital of the French Empire.

Yet it cannot be denied that the duplicity of Napoleon's negotiation with the Allies through the medium of Austria was very ill contrived. The Allies had sent M. de Nesselrode to Vienna, threatening to negotiate directly with Napoleon. This menace had obtained in turn a distinct promise from Francis and M. de Metternich to join the Allies if France continued to reject terms of peace down to the conclusion of the armistice. The negotiation, therefore, now grew more definite. Napoleon accordingly resolved by every expedient to kill time. He multiplied questions of diplomatic form. When M. de Bubna reached Dresden with the views of Austria, his note to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs was not answered for four or five days. When the reply reached him, it was found to contain an objection that he was not formally accredited, and was not in a position to deliver a note. When this chicanery was surmounted, it was discovered that the character of the mediation had not been accurately defined. When the mediation was defined, it was found to be incompatible with the terms of the Austrian and French alliance, the mediation having, as it happens, been originated by Napoleon himself. And when re-primination began, the French Emperor bitterly complained of the Austrian Minister's procrastination!

At length M. de Metternich himself came to Dresden on the 25th of June; he saw Bassano on the 26th, and after two

days duly wasted in discussion by the French Minister, had his famous audiences of Napoleon on the 28th and 30th. M. Thiers states that he here derives his narrative from the Prince himself; but he acknowledges that he has suppressed several of the expressions which the Prince describes Napoleon to have used. Whenever the autobiography of M. de Metternich shall be published, we shall probably be made aware of the whole truth. Until then, this volume of M. Thiers will probably be the best exponent of those two historic days.

While Metternich was being conducted through the ante-chambers of the Marcolini Palace thronged by diplomatists and military officers, he was earnestly addressed by Berthier, who spoke in the name of the French army. 'Well, do you bring us peace? . . . Be reasonable, then. . . . Let us end this war; for we have need of its cessation, and you as well as ourselves.' He passed into the Imperial cabinet. The great man was courteous, but cold. 'Vous voilà donc, M. de Metternich, *vous venez bien tard*,' said Napoleon, who alone had postponed his visit. 'I have thrice restored the Emperor Francis to his throne,' in all the assumed bitterness of recrimination that springs from a sense of ingratitude. 'I even committed the fault,' pursued the gallant soldier, 'of marrying his daughter.' . . . 'The Russians and Prussians, in spite of their cruel experience, have dared, emboldened by the success of last winter, to encounter me, and I have beaten them, beaten them well, although they have told you the reverse. You desire then, you too, to have your turn? Well, be it so: you shall have it. I grant you a rendezvous at Vienna, in October.' The Austrians had their turn; and the rendezvous of October was kept, not at Vienna, but on the field of Leipzig, where Clement, Count of Metternich, was created a Prince of the Empire.

Yet so unsuccessful a diplomatist was Napoleon, that a moment of passion would destroy the illusion he had been fostering during a whole negotiation, and reveal the hideous rapacity of his character. 'I have traversed your regiments,' said M. de Metternich, in a malicious vein; 'your soldiers are *enfants*. You have made anticipated levies, and have called out a generation hardly formed: that generation once destroyed in war, will you anticipate again; will you call out a generation yet younger?' Napoleon was stung to the quick. Pale with rage, and throwing down his hat, which Metternich did not stoop to pick up, he walked straight up to the Minister: 'Vous n'êtes pas militaire: you have not, as I have, the soul of a soldier. . . . *What are two hundred thousand men to me?*' After this avowal, equally

brutal and impolitic, he proceeded to insult a gentleman where he ought to have conciliated a minister. 'You wish, then, to declare war against me. Be it so. What are your means? Two hundred thousand men in Bohemia, do you say? and you pretend to make me believe such fables as those!' Napoleon had disclosed in a moment, to the astute Minister of Austria, the whole policy which the French stage had been summoned from Paris to conceal. Peace or war turned simply on a cold-blooded calculation of strength. 'Au revoir à Vienne!' was the defiant boast with which this audience terminated. 'My conscience,' said Metternich to Berthier, 'is clear; and your master has lost his reason.'

M. Thiers ascribes the changed manner of Napoleon to Metternich during the second interview, on the 30th, to the mere triumph of calculation over impulse. Napoleon, he tells us, became his own critic. He had scarcely dismissed Metternich, when it struck him that he had wholly forgotten the extension of the armistice, the very question on which he had summoned him to Dresden, and the basis of his whole diplomacy. It was clear, therefore, that his anger had not been feigned. He despatched M. de Bassano on the instant to conciliate the insulted Minister of Austria, whom he sent for again on the next day. He then appeared, writes M. Thiers, 'like a sky cleared by a storm, and overwhelmed him with caresses.'

But if the author had read either Fain's *Memoirs*, or Bignon's *History*, he would have perceived that this altered manner, from which he attempts to illustrate Napoleon's character, arose from the intelligence of the battle of Vittoria, which he had received on the day intervening between the two audiences of Metternich.

It will have been perceived that the common portraiture of Napoleon and Metternich as the lion overcome by the fox, is quite false. Napoleon himself was fox even more than lion. It is equally untrue that Metternich, having masked his designs until his preparations were complete, made at length enormous demands as the price of peace. When the time of negotiation came, the Austrian conditions were certainly not long withheld, nor were they by any means unreasonable. Napoleon did not dare avow to his ministers or his marshals, that peace or war turned simply on the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, the Rhenish Confederacy, and the Continental System. Even at that moment the Allies consented to recognise the French Empire from the Gulf of Venice to the German Ocean.

The position attained by Prince Metternich at this juncture was the result of his own character, even more than of his cir-

cumstances. He possessed, writes M. Thiers with much justice, 'un esprit sans froideur, une politique sans passion.' He always comprehended his position, and he never lost an opportunity. He acted with equal justice and calculation. He never committed himself in haste, and he never made a retrograde step. His conduct was always politic, and never precipitate. When he assumed the Austrian Government three days after the battle of Wagram had been lost, he immediately substituted conciliation and alliance for unsuccessful war. When drawn by that alliance into hostilities with Russia, in 1812, he restricted those hostilities to the providing of a contingent stipulated by a previous treaty. When the French disaster had brought back the Russian armies into Poland, he concluded a secret treaty with Russia. When he had established Austria as a neutral Power, he became the mediator between the belligerents. This disposition to follow the current until he could control its course, naturally exposed him to the keen sarcasms even of Lord Castlereagh and Sir Charles Stewart, in 1813.* He survived in office three schools of French statesmen: he survived the reign of Talleyrand, Maret, and Caulaincourt: he survived the reign of Villèle, Montmorency, and Chateaubriand; and he survived, though narrowly as a minister, the system of Louis-Philippe and M. Guizot. He held power during the changes of nearly forty years, because he identified himself with the successful principles of the day. He was first the minister of the French alliance; he was next the minister of European independence; and the remainder of his long political life was devoted to the maintenance of the political structure which in 1815 he mainly contributed to raise. The services rendered by M. de Metternich to the independence of Europe can never be forgotten, and his amazing political foresight and coolness have never been more conspicuously displayed than they are in M. Thiers' narrative.

The comedy of the Prague Congress opened on the 11th of July. Napoleon had gained an extension of the armistice until the 16th of August. He desired another fortnight, and accordingly resumed the game of losing time. The Russian and Prussian plenipotentiaries reached Prague on the 11th of July. On the 15th, the French plenipotentiaries had not been named. Napoleon, having taken care to leave Dresden for Magdeburg

* It is singular that these aspersions upon a living statesman should have been published with so little reservation by the editor of the Castlereagh Correspondence, who was during forty years a personal friend of Prince Metternich.

before the ratification of the convention prolonging the armistice could arrive, threw on Metternich the blame that it had not been transmitted before his departure. On his return, he first nominated, and then deceived, Narbonne and Caulaincourt. The latter was chosen to detach Russia, if possible, from the alliance, and to cover by his character the jugglery of the negotiation.

A yet more hollow pretext for delay followed. The military commissaries of the Allies, who had no share in the Prague negotiation, imagined that the armistice expired without notice on the 10th. Napoleon seized the pretext, and lost a few more days by declaring that Caulaincourt should not leave Dresden until their error had been set right. Abandoning the hope of separating Russia, he tried next to dissociate Austria. At length, towards the end of July, the Congress grew importunate. Napoleon, therefore, assumed great activity; he at once despatched his withheld plenipotentiaries to Prague, with clear instructions to employ a week in discussing the *form* of the Conferences. He then went to meet Maria Louisa at Mayence, in order to avoid inconvenient proximity to Prague, and to conciliate Francis by a display of devotion to his favourite daughter.

It is true that, as the armistice was about to expire, Napoleon offered certain concessions, and affected serious negotiation. M. Thiers ascribes the compromise to his desire for peace at the last moment. The inference appears to us ill-founded. The proposal was made secretly by Caulaincourt to M. de Metternich; and it was not confided to Narbonne. It involved the concession simply of Illyria and the Duchy of Warsaw. If it had been dictated by any other view than that of detaching Austria from the alliance, why should it have been made in secret? If it had been dictated either by a desire of peace, or the extension of an illusory armistice, why should it have been accompanied, as it was, by an offensive and insulting formal note to the Congress?

The French military preparations were now complete. Napoleon had combined the mental vigour of Cromwell with the physical activity of Charlemagne. He had designed every thing, and he had seen every thing. His recruits, his stores, his defences, his dispositions, were ready for the new campaign. He had enlivened his troops during the long armistice by instituting games and prizes; but he had taken care to restrict his prizes to proficiency in shooting at a mark. His calculation came to the aid of his generosity; for every prize given was presumptively equivalent to a German or a Russian shot. His

doomed army kept the Fête Napoléon on the 10th of August, the day on which the armistice was denounced. 'Napoleon,' writes M. Thiers, 'sought, as it were, to enliven war, and 'mingle games with death.'

Meanwhile, in the very throng of his army, he himself lived isolated and alone. Jomini asserts that at an earlier period he held his place among them by fear only. By all who dared he was besieged for peace. Continued opposition and shaken confidence developed a nervous agitation which his activity imperfectly concealed. Even his sentimental grief on the death of Duroc, to which M. Thiers appeals in evidence of his depth of feeling, simply implies that no course of crime can entirely uproot the springs of the human heart. He had deceived all around him, and he was distrusted by all in turn.

Napoleon and the allied commanders reciprocally based their tactics on the defeat of each other's forces in detail. The Allies were divided into three armies: the Army of the North, under Bernadotte, covered Berlin, and threatened the French left; the Army of Silesia, under Blücher, threatened the French centre; and the Grand Army in the Bohemian hills, nominally commanded by Schwarzenberg, threatened Dresden and the French right. The French forces, independently of 40,000 in garrison on the Upper Elbe, were divided into three corresponding armies, and into an auxiliary force, chiefly of guards and cavalry, which Napoleon held at Dresden to support whichever of his lieutenants might be first threatened, or be moved forward to attack. It was the aim of each of the allied commanders singly to defeat single French armies, and to retire whenever Napoleon commanded and his reserves arrived. It was chiefly the aim of Napoleon to defeat the allied armies singly, by marching his reserves in support of each of his own lieutenants in succession.

It requires no tactician to demonstrate that the scheme of Napoleon was an elaborate blunder. Both himself and his reserves, in strategic language, were placed in the air. They marched and countermarched; but at each point of danger battle receded like an Eastern mirage. In one general action only, that of Dresden, could Napoleon command in person, and with his reserves. Instead, therefore, of crushing each enemy with overwhelming force, his army of reserve was eliminated by his own tactics.

This fatal error sprang from a compromise between pride and prudence—between his political and strategical objects. Napoleon had adopted the base of the Elbe, in order to maintain the Continental System; and he had extended his line along that base

in order to threaten Berlin. His base of operations, therefore, was false in principle and false in detail. This view is admitted by nearly all strategists. When the grand army was before Dresden, Moreau dissuaded attack, on the ground that the position 'would fall of itself at a future time.' The adoption of the centre of a hostile circle is regarded by Cathcart as defensible only when 'the enemy can be brought to battle 'without delay.' This is exactly what Napoleon could not ensure, and what the Allies had concerted to defeat. M. Thiers, while he acknowledges the French base to have been too wide, and therefore false in detail, praises the abstract adoption of that base, which general authority has condemned.

Great anxiety was expressed by the French generals lest their line of defence on the Elbe should be turned by the grand army in Bohemia. Napoleon, on the other hand, ridiculed the notion that 400,000 men could be turned under cover of a chain of fortresses by any of which they might debouch at will. Here he was presumptively right: for the allied generals did not attempt to turn his base while it was so defended; and their march on Dresden was simply, as will be seen, a diversion in favour of the Silesian army. But they judged otherwise when the French had been halved in number, and had been defeated in three general actions. The strategy of Napoleon, nevertheless, consisted of two cardinal errors. He first exposed his army to be beaten in detail on a defensible base: he next adhered to that base when his loss of numbers had rendered it indefensible. The former error produced the defeats of Wahlstadt, Grossbeeren, and Dennewitz; the latter involved the concentration of the Allies on the field of Leipsic.

The destruction of the French legions within eight weeks, by armies inferior in number and disorganised in command, materially affects the military fame of Napoleon. M. Thiers attempts to vindicate his genius by large misrepresentations of fact. He computes the allied forces in the field, and on the Saxon frontier, at 500,000, and their reserves at 250,000 more. He rates the grand army in the Bohemian hills at 250,000; the Silesian army of Blücher at 100,000; and the army of the North at 150,000. Now, according to the authoritative commentaries of General Cathcart, the grand army did not exceed 150,000; the Silesian army 75,000; and the army of the North 76,000.* The total is but 301,000; and the armies of reserve brought into the campaign of Leipsic did not exceed 80,000. This is the ascertained difference between the

* Cathcart, pp. 190-3.

official and real armies of the Allies, between their paper force and their troops actually in the field.

The French armies in Saxony, on the other hand, amounted to 400,000, according to the concurrent testimony of M. Thiers, of Cathcart, of Fain, and of Napoleon himself.* The French garrisons, again, in Northern Germany are fixed by M. Thiers at 90,000 additional troops; and the corresponding garrisons or blockading force of the Allies were considerably inferior to that number.

But the last hour of the armistice had struck. Napoleon fixed his quarters at Görlitz, midway between Dresden and his Silesian army, reconnoitred Bohemia through the pass of Zittau, returned, and watched the first foreshadowing of events—

‘*Ceu flamina prima*

Cum deprensa fremunt sylvis, et cæca volutant
Murmura, venturos nautis prodentia ventos.’

The suspense was broken on the side of Silesia. But by whom it was broken is not clear. M. Thiers asserts that Blücher anticipated the close of the armistice by two days, and Lord Londonderry that Ney took the offensive. It is probable that neither statement is accurate; for while the attitude of Napoleon implies that he awaited attack, the fact that he did not advance from Görlitz until the 20th in support of Ney, implies also that no demonstration had been made by Blücher previously to the expiration of the armistice on the 16th.

These movements illustrate what we have just said. On the 21st, Napoleon had arrayed 130,000 men against Blücher, who with 75,000 had, then at least, driven in the troops of Ney. But battle vanished before the magician whose power was gone. Blücher fell back: he drew Napoleon after him into Silesia; the allied grand army descended from the Bohemian mountains; they drove in the French columns in advance of Dresden; the pursuit in Silesia was arrested; and the phantom-following army of reserve was led back to Dresden. Blücher then rallied; he suddenly attacked Macdonald, though still at the head of greater numbers than his own; and routed the French army of Silesia, with the loss of 103 guns and 18,000 prisoners, before the counter-marching army of reserve could deliver Dresden. If the allied grand army had adhered with the fidelity of Blücher to the plan on which the generals had agreed at Trachenberg, they would have retired on the return of Napoleon, of which they were aware in due time, and no defeat of Dresden would have been sustained.

* St. Cyr. vol. iv. p. 365.

The commencement of this campaign appears to have been misconceived on all sides. By M. Thiers, who commonly offers up a marshal as the scapegoat of his hero, the vindication of Napoleon and the censure of the French generals are equally indiscriminate. By Marshal St. Cyr the Emperor is represented to have had no tactics. By Sir A. Alison he is said to have been surprised. By General Cathcart he is criticised for attacking Blücher before he had crossed the Bober.

Now it was the aim of Napoleon to crush the Silesian army before Schwarzenberg could drive in the troops which defended the advance on Dresden. Had he waited therefore until that army had passed the Bober, the descent of Schwarzenberg would have anticipated his operations against Blücher. That the strictures of St. Cyr, again, are unfounded, is clear from Napoleon's published letters to the Marshal himself, developing as complete a plan as the unknown movements of two distinct armies would permit, and anticipating the descent of Schwarzenberg. That the French generals are unjustly blamed by M. Thiers, in not maintaining their frontiers in advance of Dresden, is clear from the testimony of Lord Londonderry, himself present, that they were driven in by sheer force. Napoleon had foreseen the descent, but he had not adequately provided the defence.

It is clear that the descent of the allied grand army from the Bohemian mountains was simply a diversion in favour of the Silesian army, and that the movements of Schwarzenberg were subordinate to those of Blücher. Napoleon therefore had judged right before the event; and Sir A. Alison, who compassionates his blindness in not perceiving that the chief attack would be made on the side of Bohemia, has misconceived the plan of the Allies after the event. The grand allied army throughout their movements had no definite aim; and although this want of aim arose in part from a want of unity, it is clear that no principal attack would have been made without both unity and aim. It is at any rate on record that their leaders altered their intentions day by day, and made no attempt on Dresden until after Napoleon and his guards had returned from Silesia.

On these points the narrative of Sir A. Alison is a pure fable. 'The attack,' he writes of the grand allied army before Dresden, 'was indeed terrible;' and he represents Napoleon as re-entering Dresden at nine in the morning of the day previous to the battle, 'on his hands and knees, in order to escape the Russian cannon which flew over his head.' This imaginative picture is the romantic exaggeration of an ill-judged

assault made, in the words of Schwarzenberg, 'by reconnoitring corps;' and in the words of Londonderry, 'when it was already dark.' The latter also writes, that no firing took place until three in the afternoon of this day, which was the 26th; and we gather from all authorities that Napoleon entered Dresden at nine or ten in the morning.

But the alarm with which the descent of the grand army inspired the French commanders, and with which it even inspired Napoleon himself at Stolpen, was an alarm simply of numbers and of demonstrations. At the allied headquarters all was anarchy. Five at the least contended for the command. Schwarzenberg, the titular chief, was controlled by Alexander and Frederick William; and they again were influenced or advised by Moreau and Jomini. Even Wittgenstein, during the battle itself, when ordered by Schwarzenberg to advance his guns, sent him a flat refusal. When the grand army first advanced, the sovereigns and the generals contended whether it should threaten Dresden or Leipsic. When it had reached Dresden, after the sovereigns had overruled the generals, the generals would not consent to the attack. When this dispute was compromised in turn by an attack of reconnoitring corps, the storming, as we have said, did not begin until it was dark. And when the army was obviously beaten in the next day's battle, the Austrian and the Czar fiercely contended whether it should retreat or not. Schwarzenberg afterwards broke forth to Lord Londonderry, in bitter and just complaint, that there was no commanding an army with kings and emperors in the field.

It is not surprising that the French writers have not yet exhausted their panegyric on the last great battle which Napoleon won, which threw a deceptive glory over the annals of the declining Empire, in which five sovereigns in person and 250,000 men contended for the German soil; where the rapid revulsion of all military breasts from grave apprehension, and of all peaceful breasts from the wildest terror to tumultuous exultation, was ascribed to the agency of the chief who, far off in Silesia when the danger arose, had brought back his army to deliver his citadel and to defend his lines; where the citizens of a German capital, long oppressed beyond endurance by French exaction, yet looked up to the French Cæsar as their deliverer from the passions and the violence of men of their own nation; from whence the baffled legions of three empires were driven back to the ignominious shelter of the Bohemian forests; and in which the achievement of a great victory nearly at the same instant with three signal disasters sustained by the French generals, threw into boldest

contrast the distinctive genius of Napoleon. Such was the battle of Dresden, delivered by the French for the preservation of their base, on the 27th of August, 1813.

M. Thiers has surpassed all his predecessors in his picture of this action. Napoleon (he represents) reached Dresden at nine in the morning of the previous day. By his beleaguered troops, by wounded soldiers, by German burghers, he was received with equal enthusiasm as the preserver of all; for men not less than women live fast in the terror of an apprehended siege. He next appeared at the palace, where he reassured the King of Saxony, who was justly trembling for his crown. From the summit of one of the steeples of the city, which he several times ascended, he next traced the false dispositions of the allied grand army stretched along the ascending slopes of Racknitz which surround Dresden on the Bohemian side. On the arrival of his Young Guard, he repelled the storming parties of the Allies in two brilliant sallies. He then dictated his dispositions for the next day's battle. During the night, he supped with his marshals as the guest of the King of Saxony, and with unusual quietude of manner announced for the next day a decisive battle and the discomfiture of the enemy.

But this descriptive power does not save M. Thiers' credit as a historian even of French affairs. The result of his boasted research among the archives of his country is here also nearly inappreciable. He tells us little that is new: he falls into positive inaccuracy: he is even in arrear of the knowledge of preceding writers. One reservation, indeed, must be made. He ascribes the return of Napoleon from the pursuit of the grand army to the intelligence of the defeats of Grossbeeren and the Katzbach which had overtaken him at Pirna, rather than to illness.

Yet this solitary discovery is hardly of importance. Take, on the other hand, M. Thiers' view of the tactics of Napoleon on his march from Silesia for the relief of Dresden. He describes him as halting at Stolpen, whence the road diverges to Dresden and Königstein, long uncertain whether to attack in front or flank; and only abandoning at the last moment his design of turning the grand army, with his whole force, by the bridge of Königstein, and of 'thus terminating the war by one of the finest combinations of his life.'

Now it happens that the *Memoirs of Marmont, Duke of Ragusa*, contain a continuous succession of despatches from the Emperor to this marshal, which exhibit, during the whole period of the march, an unwavering resolution to deliver battle to the enemy with his main force under the walls of Dresden, and to

confide to the corps of Vandamme the auxiliary movement by the bridge of Königstein, which M. Thiers represents him as ultimately exchanging for the scheme of crossing the Elbe in the rear of the Allies with his whole army. It is impossible, therefore, that any documents to which M. Thiers may have had access in the French archives can refute this explicit and decisive testimony. Marmont has been charged with gross, even wilful, inaccuracy in his own narrative; but not with a forgery of despatches; and still less where their genuineness is supported by external evidence, and where Marmont could have had no interest in their fabrication.

Here, then, this author's novelty is inaccurate: let us see if, elsewhere in his description of this train of events, his accuracy is novel. Take the action of Culm and the capitulation of Vandamme, on which M. Thiers professes special originality. We have already said that he scarcely ever cites his authorities. In this instance, however, he produces the elaborate orders of Napoleon to Vandamme, dated from Pirna on the 28th, requiring him 'to penetrate into Bohemia,' and 'to seize the communications with Töplitz.' But these orders have long been published in Baron Fain's *Memoirs*, and in Bignon's *History*. It is singular that an author professing to write from original materials, and exceptionally producing his materials as the chief elements of his originality, should simply reproduce documents already public.

But this is not all. M. Thiers not only reproduces old testimony where his language *implies* that he produces new; he even reproduces what is least conclusive, and leaves himself far in the rear of such historians as Bignon and Jomini, and of such memoir-writers as Fain, Marmont, and St. Cyr. The despatch of Napoleon from Pirna on the 28th does not necessarily imply that he had required Vandamme to march into the vale of Töplitz itself; and upon such an order the whole case against both Napoleon and Vandamme clearly turns. If Vandamme had no more distinct orders than these, it may plausibly be charged against him that he exceeded his instructions. If Napoleon had given none more definite, it may, with equal plausibility, be said that he neither issued rash orders nor falsely disavowed his lieutenant.

But the despatch of Berthier (Napoleon's major-general) to Vandamme on the 29th, — 'March direct on Töplitz, and you will cover yourself with glory,' — is conclusive on both points. This is the testimony of the '*Victoires et Conquêtes*.' The despatch, again, of Berthier to Marmont on the 30th, — 'The enemy, turned by General Vandamme, who is marching upon Töplitz,

‘ will find itself greatly embarrassed, and will probably be obliged to relinquish the greater part of its *matériel*,’ — indicates with equal clearness the subsequent falsehood of Napoleon, and the immense expectations which he founded on his fatal order. This is the testimony of the Duke of Ragusa’s Memoirs. M. Thiers deals with this subject as though neither evidence were in existence. He even ignores the lying despatch to St. Cyr of the 1st of September, two days after the capitulation, in which Napoleon disavows his conclusive orders of the 29th.

The dilemma in which an author can only escape from what we must term ‘involuntary distortion,’ through an ignorance of the most important writings in his own language, is not enviable. It would certainly be hard to suppose that one who does not scruple to depict the falsehood and impolicy of Napoleon during the armistice, should scruple to depict his duplicity and false tactics during the campaign. And it is certain that M. Thiers acquits Vandamme as readily as he acquits Buonaparte. Yet it would be necessary to discover some other hypothesis for his hero than the implication of Vandamme, if we were to suppose that the author had read the memoirs of Marmont and St. Cyr. And his elaborate inquiry into the catastrophe of Culm, which ignores the real elements of a decision, and glosses over the conduct of Napoleon, betrays just such a glimmering of hard truths brought by St. Cyr against his master, as would incite an author of M. Thiers’ ordinary bias to throw revengefully on that marshal the burden of the capitulation.

His position here is an indefensible paradox. He charges St. Cyr with the reverse of Culm, in exclusion of every other general, on the ground that he alone could succour Vandamme, and failed to do so. Yet he shows that three other marshals, Victor, Marmont, and Mortier, received equally stringent orders; and he himself quotes Napoleon’s orders to St. Cyr, which daily change that marshal’s plan of operations, in a degree which must surely have paralysed continuous support. Napoleon’s disavowal of his own orders was based, indeed, upon a belief that Vandamme had been killed in action. We know that it is easy to kick a dead animal: but it sometimes happens that a live animal may be safely kicked also. If M. Thiers’ reasoning be true, why should Napoleon have risked a false aspersion on Vandamme, when he might justly have thrown the whole imputation on St. Cyr?

Had we been the apologists of Napoleon, we might have offered a certain palliation of ungenerous falsehood such as this, in the truth that the whole fabric of the Empire was dependent on the military reputation of its chief; and that the disavowal

of Vandamme was perhaps an essential incident in the system under which many other crimes had originally been committed for its support. Such a position would be less indefensible at least than the deduction of M. Thiers, which mildly criticises Napoleon 'for attempting too much,' while it ignores his falsehood.

These are but fair illustrations of the inaccuracy which pervades M. Thiers' narrative of the movements even of the French armies. If the 'justice' of these examples be questioned, it is easy to adduce others. We have already dealt with the actions of Dresden and Culm: we will glance next at those of the Katzbach, Grossbeeren, and Dennewitz.

In dealing with the actions on the Katzbach, M. Thiers first nearly inverts the relative numbers of the French and of the allied army of Silesia, and he then widely misconceives the result of their engagement. We have already noticed his computation of the allied Silesian army under Blücher at 150,000, and have cited the authorities which reduce it to 75,000. He next asserts that the French Silesian army under Macdonald numbered but 70,000; while Napoleon's own despatch, published in the '*Victoires et Conquêtes*,' computes their number at not less than 100,000. 'Inform the Duke of Tarentum' (wrote the Emperor to Berthier, when on the 23rd of August he was quitting Silesia to drive Schwarzenberg from Dresden), 'that I have placed under his orders the army of the Bober*, consisting of 100,000 men, inclusive of infantry, cavalry, artillery, and engineers.' Is it possible that M. Thiers has not read this despatch among the 'thirty thousand' which he professes to have accurately examined?

M. Thiers next asserts that the French Silesian army lost but 3000 men in action during successive combats on the Katzbach; that Blücher took but 7000 or 8000 prisoners, and that the total loss of the French was extended to 20,000 by means of 10,000 desertions.† It is hardly probable that a disciplined army of 100,000 men, commanded by a marshal of France, would fall back in discomfiture after a succession of skirmishes which had together cost them only 3000 in action. If we turn to Lord Londonderry, we find the French prisoners alone computed at 20,000, and the guns captured at 100. If we turn to Cathcart, we find the prisoners computed at 18,000, and the captured guns at 103, on the authority, as we have said, of Blücher's general order. If we turn to Bignon, we find the French loss computed by a patriotic French historian at 10,000

* Called so interchangeably with 'the army of Silesia.'

† Vol. xvi. p. 377.

in killed and wounded, and 15,000 in prisoners, independently of desertion.*

The numbers described by M. Thiers to have been engaged in the battles of Grossbeeren and Dennewitz are equally irreconcilable with other testimony. These actions were the result of two distinct attempts of the French army of the North to threaten Berlin, which were met and defeated by the allied army of the North. 6000 French and 12,000 Saxons, under Regnier, are supposed by M. Thiers to have encountered 30,000 Prussians under Bulow at Grossbeeren.† It is acknowledged, on the other hand, by Napoleon himself, that Regnier commanded in that action 24,000 Saxons alone.‡ 15,000 French are also supposed by M. Thiers to have encountered 40,000 Prussians at the commencement of the battle of Dennewitz, and 47,000 French to have encountered 80,000 allied troops before its close.§ It is acknowledged by Napoleon, again, that 70,000 French were here defeated by 45,000 Prussians. It is true that the Prince Royal, with a force of Russians and Swedes, came upon the field at the close of the action: but it is allowed by Bignon himself that the French were giving way on all sides when the Prince Royal arrived.|| The French loss is here computed by M. Thiers at 20 guns, 7,500 men, killed, wounded, and taken, and an equal number deserted. It is computed by Cathcart and Londonderry at 80 guns, and at 10,000 men in prisoners alone. The battle of Dresden is similarly described by M. Thiers as won by Napoleon against 180,000 men actually on the field; whereas the diversion of fully 30,000 troops from a total of only 150,000 renders it impossible that the army defeated at Dresden can have exceeded 120,000.

We are too well aware of the difficulty of distinguishing true from fictitious returns, and of occasional discrepancies between authoritative and unbiassed writers, to regard a certain proportion of error, where numbers are concerned, as an appreciable slur on the credit of a historian. But this latitude cannot extend to a writer whose numerical accuracy is quite exceptional, whose error invariably favours the French and prejudices the German cause, whose statements are scarcely supported by the production of a single authority, and are contradicted indifferently in the language of friend and foe. It will be seen, then,

* Londonderry.—Cathcart, p. 246.—Bignon, vol. xii. p. 313.

† Thiers, vol. xvi. p. 386.

‡ Jomini, *Vie de Napoléon*, vol. iv. p. 460–7.

§ Thiers, vol. xvi. p. 428. 433.

|| Bignon, vol. xii. p. 336.

that M. Thiers is hardly more accurate in describing the campaigns of Napoleon in Germany than in dealing with the fleets and the armies of England.

We will now touch on the combinations of the first days of October, which brought the armies of France and those of the Allies on the field of Leipzig, and sealed the catastrophe of the Empire.

The concentration of the allied forces in the rear of Napoleon took place under an entire change in the relations of the two armies. It is acknowledged by M. Thiers that as early as the 5th of September the French legions had been reduced from 360,000 to 250,000 in the field,—in other words, Napoleon had lost 110,000 men in twenty days. Cathcart computes the French loss, not made up by recruits, at 148,000, early in October. Men and horses, according to Lord Londonderry, from a failure of local supplies, were dying of starvation in the mountains. The French army in the field, overworked, dispirited and defeated, did not now exceed 190,000, in consequence of the increase of the garrisons on the Upper Elbe. The allied army, on the other hand, which had lost 60,000, and had gained 80,000 recruits, numbered 320,000, of whom a quarter of a million were available for concentration in the rear of Napoleon. M. Thiers, who magnifies the allied forces in Saxony at this juncture to the extent of 600,000, and their numbers actually concentrated at Leipzig to 320,000, is again contradicted by every credible witness.

This movement, vaguely shadowed out by Moreau, but developed and carried into execution by Blücher, was probably the most daring and successful that had been executed by any German general since the age of the Great Frederic. While Schwarzenberg, with 120,000 from the south, and Bernadotte, with 60,000 from the north, converged in comparative security upon Halle and Weissenfels, Blücher, with 65,000, cut through the inner circle of Napoleon's operations, still defended by four-fold odds, crossed the Elbe, and exchanged the base of Breslau for the base of Bohemia, as Wellington a few months before had exchanged the base of Lisbon for the base of Santander. There can be little doubt, though we have not seen it remarked, that these tactics were adopted by collusion with Bavaria, whose open defection was not made known to Napoleon until the 12th of October. By these means the Allies turned the French lines on either side, concentrated 245,000 men, compelled Napoleon to fight with a river in his rear, and intercepted his communications with France by the defection of a Bavarian army on the Rhine.

While everything was turning upon these movements, the character of Napoleon underwent an extraordinary change. From energy he passed to inaction, from misplaced confidence to the strangest irresolution. M. Thiers, indeed, sees only his 'admirable tactics,' and his 'deep foresight.' But those who collate the defective history of this author with other records will verify our conclusions. So early as the 8th of September, two days after Dennewitz had been fought, Napoleon had ordered the fortified places on the Rhine to be strengthened and provisioned. A week afterwards, according to M. Thiers, he had ordered immense preparations for the wintering of his army on the Elbe. In this calculation for a double contingency, indeed, there was no inconsistency. But if we pass to his conversation with St. Cyr immediately before he left Dresden to immolate his army on the field of Leipzig, we find him acknowledging, on the 6th of October, at once that his position at Dresden had been untenable from the first, and that the freezing of the Elbe would soon render indefensible his whole line of operations! * Yet at this very juncture, as M. Thiers himself writes, and while the storm was gathering in his rear, he countermanded as 'premature' the provisioning of his Rhenish fortresses.

The vacillation and inactivity of Napoleon during the decisive movements of the Allies, for which neither M. Thiers nor any other historian has attempted to account, is but faintly explained by a startling assertion which rests, we believe, on the single authority of the late Lord Londonderry. It appears that during the latter part of September, Maret Duke of Bassano had opened a secret negotiation with the Austrian Emperor for a general congress. So happily did this proposal address itself to the rivalries already developed between allied princes, ministers, and generals, that a new suspension of hostilities became probable at the very moment that the three commanders-in-chief were devising the interception of the French army. Lord Londonderry, who writes with the authority of a British Minister at Toplitz, ascribes the ultimate rejection of this overture to the paramount will of Metternich.

In the campaign of Dresden Napoleon had been outgeneraled by an enemy whom he himself had largely outnumbered. In the campaign of Leipzig he was outnumbered in turn; but he was even more completely outgeneraled. Here of course M. Thiers dissents. No catastrophe that had befallen the enemies of Napoleon during his happier campaigns had been more rapid and complete. When he left Dresden on the 7th of October, he had nearly

* St. Cyr, vol. iv. pp. 178-88.

200,000 troops in the field. Between the Elbe and the Oder, inclusive of the free garrisons which he might concentrate at any moment, and of the blockaded garrisons which he now designed to deliver, he had scarcely less than 350,000. The concentration of this force, in any other juncture, would have given the law to Europe as effectually as Scipio gave law to Carthage at Zama, as Solyman gave law to Hungary at Mohacz, as Lannoy gave law to France at Pavia. Yet within twelve days all was lost. His army was vanquished in the field, his garrisons were abandoned to the victors, his empire was tottering to its base; with a new enemy in his front and an old enemy in his rear, he was flying from the plains of Germany to rally fifty thousand broken troops on the banks of the Rhine.

It is clear that Napoleon did not anticipate the concentration of the allied armies on his communications at Leipsic. M. Thiers, indeed, attempts to show that he had provided against this danger. But his whole language and his whole strategy appear to us to prove the exact contrary. We have seen that, so late as the 6th of October, he had resolved to abandon Dresden, on the ground that the position was untenable against the grand army of the Allies. Yet that army, five days previously, had broken up from Töplitz, and was then threatening him in a distinct quarter. Even on the 10th, he acknowledges his tactics to consist in manœuvring on the right bank of the Elbe, and in debouching through one of his fortresses to 'surprise' the enemy on its left. Could he hope to surprise an enemy 250,000 strong, concentrated on his communications, and therefore presumptively as prepared to encounter him as he had himself been prepared to encounter the Prussians in 1806, when concentrated on their communications at Jena?

If M. Thiers had read the despatch of Napoleon to Murat of the 10th of October*, he would surely have modified his views. According to M. Thiers himself, Napoleon retained Dresden with the view, until within three days of the battle of Leipsic, of debouching upon Schwarzenberg through that fortress, after he had successively defeated Blücher and Bernadotte, and had humbled Prussia by the capture of Berlin.†

There were nearly as many changes of plan in Napoleon's camp as there were days of march. After ordering the abandonment of Dresden on the 6th, he dictated a letter to Count Darn, on the very next day, equally full of blind confidence and scattered views. He there announces to Darn that he is about

* Jomini, vol. iv. p. 435.

† It is due to Sir A. Alison to observe that he traces this portion of the campaign with much research and general fidelity.

to fight a decisive battle; and that 'since he will gain the battle, 'Dresden will always be his centre!''* Neither has M. Thiers read this despatch; or he would not have referred to the 10th a changed design, with regard to Dresden, which originated on the 7th.† On the 10th Napoleon writes to St. Cyr that he 'would 'compel the Silesian army to receive battle on the next day.'‡ He designed, after defeating that army, to turn next on Bernadotte. But the Silesian army escaped him; and Bernadotte, who was trimming between two parties, was perpetually counter-marching in order to avoid a conflict with the French which might compromise his succession to Napoleon's throne. The allied armies appeared everywhere, eluded him everywhere, baffled his discernment everywhere.

Until the 12th he remained at Düben uncertain where to strike a blow, still resolved to carry war into the North, and meanwhile entreated by his staff to secure his basis on the Rhine. In this conflict of will, in this maze of doubt, the scene suddenly shifted, and the whole peril of his situation lay visibly before him. He learned at once that Schwarzenberg and Blücher were rapidly concentrating on Leipsic, and that the Bavarian army had turned against him on the Rhine. He instantly marched on Leipsic, too late to defeat the concentration, and yet exposing his garrisons, too distant to be made available on the field, to be overwhelmed in the event of his defeat.

M. Thiers, who treats at length of British influence on the Continent in earlier periods of the Empire, is silent on the sacrifices, the diplomacy, and the example of this country during the struggle of 1813. He tells us nothing of the arms and treasure which we supplied to our German Allies, of the ten millions with which we paid and maintained their troops during six months of that year, alone. He misapprehends, as we have seen, the influence of the Duke of Wellington's Spanish victories upon the policy of France and Austria. And he describes the deliberations of the Continental Powers as turning wholly on the counsels of Continental statesmen.

There can be no more striking illustration of this deficiency than his total silence on the great public services of the Earl of Aberdeen in this crisis. It is probable that, after the Duke of Wellington, no British statesman or soldier so largely influenced the successful issue of the great struggle for the freedom of Europe in 1813. Castlereagh, it will be remembered, did not

* Bignon, vol. xii. p. 341.

† Vol. xvi. p. 509.

‡ Jomini, vol. iv. p. 436.

reach the allied camp until the German campaigns had been fought and won. It may be doubted whether, but for the firmness, the tact, the temper, and the sagacity which form the character of Lord Aberdeen, the influence of England would have overcome the rival interests which first obstructed the combination of the European Powers, and next threatened the dissolution of their confederacy.

We shall glance, before we conclude, at the merits of M. Thiers' comparison between those two figures which rose colossal beneath the shadow of the Revolution, and closed, with the dignity and the poetic justice of heroic times, the grandest drama of any modern age. This comparison between Napoleon and Wellington is contemptuously described by M. Thiers in the terms '*le génie et le bon sens.*'

The difference in tactics between Wellington and Napoleon was associated, both by circumstance and by principle, with the difference of their moral character. Contrast the means by which their respective successes were attained. Bear in mind that Wellington commonly fought in a friendly, Napoleon in a hostile, territory. Bear in mind, on the other hand, that this distinction did not enable Wellington to obtain provisions without money, while it freed Napoleon from all restraint in supporting war by pillage. To pursue this contrast into the intrinsic moral characteristics which M. Thiers does not condescend to notice—to contrast a studied falsehood with an innate simplicity—to place side by side Napoleon's disavowal of his orders to Vandamme, and Wellington's spontaneous acknowledgment after the unfortunate siege of Burgos, 'the Government had nothing to say to it; it was all my own act;' to contrast a habitual respect for the rights of others, with a habitual violation of them; to distinguish between a lust of war which stamped out all morality, and a calm recognition of morality as the end of war; to weigh a justice sometimes stern, but always probably conscientious, with a vindictiveness which made light of assassination; to contrast, in short, what we know of the Duke of Wellington with a rapacity, a cruelty, a falsehood, and an arrogance such as never before combined to sully the intellectual splendour of a single name,—would be merely to dilate on comparisons which must have occurred to every reader.

But, as these characteristics of Napoleon were developed by the immoral spirit of the Revolution, and by the corrupting influence of power, so perhaps the magnitude of his military achievements, on which M. Thiers rests his superiority over all other generals of modern Europe, arose from the vast organisation at his command, and from that decline of strength and

union among his enemies which coincided with the early revolutionary wars. The distinctive claims of Napoleon to the highest fame, over such competitors as Marlborough, Wellington, and Frederic, rest rather on the civil and military institutions of the First Empire, which developed the army and created the State, and have left indelible traces in the social condition of France.

We relinquish this criticism with an increased perception of the fine intellect of the author, of his descriptive power, of his animated style, of his talent in portraying individual character. But we relinquish it with a declining estimate of his research, of his temper, of his thoughtfulness, of his justice, of his calm reasoning, of his knowledge of foreign or even of French literature, of all that involves the *credit* of a historian.

What we complain of in this history is, not simply its misstatements of fact and its false political reasonings, but also its false morality. We have said that it is the aim of this work to vindicate the First Empire. In order to attain this end, the author's facts are strained to meet a distorted morality; and his judgment is often strained to meet a distortion of fact. M. Thiers places what he terms 'l'intelligence des faits' above every other historic quality. Yet he glosses over the murder of the Duc d'Enghien with a callousness with which no other historian deals with private crime; and he attempts to justify, by an elastic theory of necessity, deeds which every other historian of the same period has condemned.

There needed no such tortuous art to interest this generation in a picture of the First Empire. Europe had forgotten neither its military achievements, nor the political greatness purchased at the cost of freedom, of national independence, and of human life. The military titles which represent the triumph of its standards from the Danube to the Tagus, and from the Apennines to the Moskowa, and the administrative institutions which have re-organised Western Europe, equally survived their origin. They still commemorate the reign of Napoleon. What was now demanded is, not a futile effort to palliate crime, but a just view of the benefits which mankind have gained in this generation from the sufferings they had experienced in the preceding age.

It should have been the aim of this history to show that the wrongs inflicted under the First Empire recoiled against its own existence, that the ills of Continental Europe in that period sprang from her want of public morality, that (even amid the domestic insecurity which later impolicy has since produced) the moral tone of government and of society draw their present elevation from the purifying influence of a great scourge.

There is a striking contrast between the principles of government defended by M. Thiers in this work, and the professions of his own political life. We have hitherto known him as the uncompromising advocate of constitutional monarchy; he here transforms himself into the indiscriminate panegyrist of a military autocracy. This inconsistency in the political philosophy of the author represents no conflict between an exoteric theory of parliamentary government, and an esoteric theory of pure despotism. For the truth is, that no other living statesman has clung with equal tenacity to his original professions in the most adverse fortune. During the later years of the reign of Louis-Philippe, as well as at its commencement, he was the representative of liberal government. When the revolution of 1848 had threatened to ostracise the advocates of kingly power, he remained the champion of constitutional monarchy. And when that system had given way in turn, he stood aloof from the restoration of the Empire as firmly as he had opposed the irruption of the Republic. Yet it is the preeminent tendency of this work to uphold the principles of administration and government which M. Thiers, in his political career, has consistently opposed, and to which his ambition has been honourably sacrificed. His historical great work is a direct contradiction of his public conduct. His political influence in defending constitutional liberty has probably been more than cancelled by his literary influence in the restoration of the Empire. His tongue has been consistently employed in opposing despotism; his pen has laboured as consistently to show that any other than a despotic government is impossible. While M. Thiers has drawn in brilliant colours his picture of the glories and the triumphs of the reign of Napoleon I., the events which have extinguished the freedom of the French nation, and still cast a deep shade over its future, spring from the same source as those which he applauds.*

* At the time at which we are writing, sixteen volumes of this history have been published; the seventeenth volume, containing the Campaign of 1814, and the Abdication of Fontainebleau, is understood to be ready for publication, and the original intention of the author was to terminate his labours at that point. We have recently learnt, however, that M. Thiers has resolved to narrate the closing scene of this eventful history on the field of Waterloo, and that an eighteenth volume of the work is in preparation, to which we may hereafter have occasion to direct our attention.

- ART. III. — 1. *Essays on the Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, the Unity of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation.* By the Rev. BADEN POWELL, M.A., F.R.S., &c., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London: 1855.
2. *The Correlation of Physical Forces.* By W. R. GROVE, Q.C., M.A., F.R.S., &c. Third Edition. London: 1855.
3. *On the Conservation of Force.* By Professor FARADAY, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c. &c.
4. *Essays from the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, with Addresses and other Pieces.* By Sir JOHN F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart., K.H. London: 1857.
5. *The Soul in Nature.* By the late Professor OERSTED. Translated by the Misses HORNER. London: 1852.
6. *Nomos. An Attempt to demonstrate a Central Physical Law in Nature.* London: 1856.

ALMOST every age of human history has either given to itself, or received from posterity, some epithet, marking, whether truly or fancifully, its distinctive place in the records of the world. It would be easy to find and to apply many such epithets to the remarkable period in which our own lot is cast; abounding, as it does, in characteristics which distinguish it from any that have ever gone before. One, which we cannot doubt that our own posterity will adopt, inasmuch as it affirms a fact equally obvious and certain, is, that we are living in *an age of transition*; — a period when changes, deeply and permanently affecting the whole condition of mankind, are occurring more rapidly, as well as extensively, than at any prior time in human history. The fact is one which lies on the very surface of all that we see in the world around us. No man of common understanding, even in the narrowest circle of observation, but must mark the continual shifting of things before him; reversing, in many cases, the maxims and usages which are the inheritance of centuries, and altering, in a thousand ways, the present conditions of material and social life. The philosopher who looks from a higher level, and upon a more distant horizon, discerns in these changes a wider and more lasting influence. He sees that they involve the relations of races and communities of men over the whole face of the globe; and that they are destined, sooner or later, to obliterate many of those diversities and lines of demarcation, which, however originally produced,

seemed almost to dis sever the species, in the contrasts of human existence they afford. He takes further note of what is the great agent in this and other changes, that wonderful progress in physical philosophy, which has placed new powers in the hands of man — powers transcending in their strangeness and grandeur the wildest fables and dreams of antiquity ; and the effects of which are already felt in every part of the habitable earth. He sees the march of discovery continually going on ; new paths opened ; new instruments and methods of research brought into action ; and new laws evolved, giving connexion and combination to the facts and phenomena which unceasingly accumulate around us.

Closely, or even necessarily, connected with the changes last denoted, is the topic to which, as suggested by the works before us, we would especially invite the attention of our readers. We allude to the concurrent changes taking place in the spirit and scope of physical philosophy at large ; scarcely less remarkable in their nature and influence than the discoveries in which they originate, and by which they are sanctioned. Modern science, in its dealings with the great physical powers or elementary forces which pervade and govern the material world, has been led, or even forced, into a bolder form and method of inquiry. Inductions of a higher class have been reached, and generalisations attained, going far beyond those subordinate laws in which science was formerly satisfied to rest. Experiment and observation, as the agents in acquiring knowledge, must always to a certain extent be alike in their objects and methods of pursuit. But the precision and refinements of modern experimental research — partly due to greater perfection of instruments, partly to the higher principles of inquiry pursued — strikingly distinguish it from that of any anterior time. With every allowance for illustrious exceptions, it is impossible to make the comparison, and not to see that the physical researches of our own day have a larger scope and more connected aim — that experiment is no longer tentative merely, but suggested by views which stretch beyond the immediate result, and hold in constant prospect those general laws which work in the universe at large. Nor is the power so gained ever now permitted to be dormant or inert. If thought suggests experiment, experiment ministers fresh materials to thought ; and the philosopher working boldly with the new forces at his command, and under the guidance of hypotheses, which extend to the very confines of human intelligence, obtains results which almost startle the imagination by the inroads they seem to make on the mysteries beyond. When flying along the railroad at forty or fifty miles an hour, with a slender wire

beside us, conveying with speed scarcely measurable, the news of nations, the demands of commerce, or the fates of war, we have an example (though few care to estimate it fully) of those mighty attainments which bind, to do our bidding, elements before unknown or uncontrolled by man; and which give certainty of other and similar attainments in time yet to come.

Admitting that hypothesis, and this often of very adventurous kind — the '*animi jactus liber*' — blends itself largely with the recent progress of physical science, we would in no way impugn this powerful instrument and aid of research; the use of which, under due limitation, is justified equally by reason and experience. In all inquiries of this nature, except those of strictly mathematical kind, certainty and conjecture necessarily and closely commingle. The speculation or bare analogy of one day becomes the scientific induction of the next; and even where hypothesis is not thus happily fated, it still has often high value as a partial interpreter and provisional guide to the truths sought for. All sciences, and very especially those of optics, of chemistry, of electricity, furnish notable instances to this effect; and have rescued hypothesis, in the philosophical sense of the term, from the vague reproach which it was once the fashion to cast upon it. Such vindication, however, affords no sanction to that spirit, which pushes mere speculation far in advance of experiment and observation, and adventures rashly into fields not prepared for human culture, if indeed ever accessible to it. Eccentric theories of this kind, the produce of imperfect knowledge or illogical understanding, will ever be found in the path of science; perplexing, it may be, to those who loosely follow it; but disappearing one after another, as truth pursues its steady course amidst them. The mysteries of organic life, approached with caution by the true philosopher, are an especial seduction to these framers of new systems, — systems which it becomes easy to coin, under shelter of a vague phraseology, and aided by the very obscurity of the subject.

While speaking thus generally on the spirit and methods of modern science, we may notice the fact, that there is scarcely one of the legitimate hypotheses of our own time, or even any great law founded on the soundest inductions from experiment, which is not prefigured in some way, more or less distinctly, in the philosophy of former ages. We might, had we space for it, give many curious instances of these anticipations; and assign reasons why they should especially be found in the more recondite parts of philosophy, such as the origin of matter, the qualities and combinations of atoms, the theories of space, ether, forces, &c., — transcendental questions which press themselves

upon the thought of the metaphysician, as well as of the naturalist and mathematician, in contemplating the phenomena of the universe. Through these avenues of thought and speculation, little aided by experiment or systematic observation, the subtlety of a few rare spirits in each early age came upon the traces of physical truths, which modern science has approached by more certain roads, and made the lawful prize of inductive research. What were then hasty and transient glances into these profound parts of philosophy, have now become a steady insight into the great physical laws under which are embodied all the phenomena of the natural world.

We have placed at the head of this article the titles of several recent works, well fitted, by their various merits and by the eminence of their authors, to illustrate the view we have briefly given of the present aspects of physical philosophy, as well as to indicate those future prospects of science, which may fairly be inferred from the spirit in which it is now pursued — the attainments still possible to human reason or human power. These are the points to which we now seek especially to direct attention. We might easily double or treble the number of the volumes thus referred to, were we to include even a small proportion of the systematic or elementary works; the lectures, memoirs, or addresses to scientific bodies; or the articles in reviews and other periodicals, which, under the influence of this new vigour of inquiry, and the practical popularity of many of its topics, have opened their pages to meet the demand for more familiar information than scientific treatises can afford. These topics, in fact, include not only the sciences treating of the simpler inorganic conditions of matter, and the elementary forces, — heat, light, electricity, gravitation, chemical affinity, which act upon the material world, — but also animal and vegetable physiology in their whole extent, and those wonderful laws of organic life, connecting matter with vitality, instincts and intellect, under the numberless forms and species which are placed before us for our contemplation. In surveying this vast field of natural knowledge, for the purposes just indicated, we must of necessity limit ourselves to a broad outline; thereby forfeiting in some part the interest which belongs to the familiar details and illustrations of each particular science; but gaining in compensation a more connected and comprehensive view of the relation between the different sciences; and of those great discoveries in all, which are ever tending to bring them into closer approximation and subjection to common laws. We need scarcely dwell on the importance of such general views, and

their influence on the spirit and progress of physical philosophy. We shall have occasion immediately to illustrate it, in speaking of the efforts made by some of the most eminent men of science of our day, to give concentration and unity to parts of physical knowledge, and to classes of phenomena, hitherto regarded as having no co-relation or common principle of action.

We do not undertake to analyse in detail, or even to notice, all the works before us. To some of them, however, and especially to those placed first on the list, we must separately refer, inasmuch as they furnish the most able exposition of those doctrines and methods of modern science which it is our object to examine. And under this view we must first notice the volume of the Rev. Baden Powell, Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford; not merely from the high scientific reputation of the author, but as embodying, and vindicating in great part, all the boldest conclusions derived from recent research. Approaching our subject through this work as the threshold, we enter at once on the highest debateable ground, amidst questions which have more or less perplexed the reason of man in all ages; formerly, as intellectual problems or paradoxes only, now, as the natural or necessary result of those experimental inquiries which have been carried through every part of the material creation.

Professor Powell's work includes three separate essays:—one on the 'Spirit of Inductive Philosophy,' another on the 'Unity of Worlds,' the last on the 'Philosophy of Creation.' The second of these essays, though containing much other valuable matter, is mainly an answer to that remarkable volume entitled the 'Plurality of Worlds,' which, despite its anonymous form and paradoxical argument, has gained credit and weight in the public mind from the eminent name attached to its probable authorship. The curious question raised, or rather revived, by this work — one destined from its very nature to be answered by *presumption* only — has already elicited so much active controversy, in which we have ourselves taken part, that we refrain from touching upon it here; though we might fairly do so as an example of the altered method in which such controversies are now carried on, and of the new class of proofs brought forward for their solution. But of the first and third of these essays of Professor Powell we must speak more in detail, in their bearing upon the subject before us.

They are written, we may first remark, with great vigour and ability of thought; with much of happy illustration, derived from the very large scientific resources of the author; and in a style singularly fitted to these subjects by its clearness and

precision. Of the boldness of the work, in advocating doctrines and hypotheses not yet fully matured by research, we have just spoken. It would not be a harsh criticism to say that Professor Powell shows a marked fondness for what is new and arduous in philosophy; and takes pleasure in stigmatising, as hindrances to truth in physical science, all such opinions as are fostered by ancient and popular belief, including those which assume Scriptural authority for their foundation. In his just zeal against dogmatical authority, he sometimes falls into the opposite rashness of lending his authority and favour to hasty and partial experimental deductions; or to doctrines still in their infancy, and checked or controverted by opposite opinions of equal weight. To this temperament of mind, as we venture to describe it, we may attribute his somewhat eager adoption of the doctrines of 'Transmutation of Species;' of 'the Unity of Composition' as a principle in physiology; of the principle of 'Continuity and immutability of physical laws in geology;' and of the Correlation or community of vital and physical forces in all the automatic acts of life, and even in many mental acts which may be thus regarded. His reasonings on the doctrine of Final Causes, or *Teleology*, as it is now the fashion to call it, have the same character and bearing. All these are broad questions, and fairly open to argument and evidence. But we have the constant feeling in the volume before us, that the leaning is too much to one and the same side of these questions:—we might fairly call it the *paradoxical side*; while admitting, at the same time, that paradoxes are often raised into the class of recognised truths; and, in a certain sense of the term, may even be deemed instruments of science, though instruments ever to be used with caution and forbearance. As a more special instance of what we have just mentioned, we might quote the sort of sanction our author gives to the crude experiments of Messrs. Crosse and Wickes on the seeming creation of animalcule life under certain conditions of the galvanic current;—a conclusion loosely drawn in its origin, without any known analogy, and not justified by any later research. On this point, as on many others in his third Essay on the 'Philosophy of Creation,' we find a close approximation to the doctrines of the 'Vestiges of Creation,' another well-known work of our own time, which by its ability has contributed greatly to diffuse a taste for these transcendental inquiries in science,—a dangerous effect, were it not corrected by the contemporaneous activity of those philosophers who make experiment and strict induction the sole measure and guides of their progress.

To the questions stated above we may especially refer, as

examples of the class of profound problems on which modern science exercises itself; seeking their solution by experiments and observations far more refined and exact than have ever before been applied to these inquiries. But there is another question largely discussed in Mr. Baden Powell's work, to which we would advert, as expounding better than any other the present spirit and scope of physical philosophy. This is the doctrine described by our author in his first essay, under the titles of 'Unity of Sciences,' and 'Uniformity of Nature,'—terms meant to express, but expressing too strongly, those admirable generalisations which have connected under common laws phenomena seemingly the most remote and unlike, and are continually tending still further so to combine and concentrate them. Taking the subject in this general sense, we cannot hesitate to regard it as one of the very highest which can be submitted to the human understanding. The unfulfilled objects of science, as well as its ultimate end and aim, evidently lie in this direction; and none can be indifferent to the wonderful results which every year is disclosing to researches pursued on this principle. Among those who have laboured most successfully for this especial object are the eminent men whose discoveries in particular branches of science have given them merited fame in the world. If out of many contemporaries we were to select a few who have done most to elevate physical science by generalisation of its phenomena and laws, the names of Arago, Faraday, Herschel, and Humboldt occur at once as first and most illustrious in this career. These philosophers have looked upon the world of nature in its largest aspects, and made their several discoveries subservient to this great object; thereby widening the circle of facts and phenomena, and at the same time drawing them more closely towards that centre in which we find so many sciences to converge.

Nevertheless we must not allow these terms of 'Unity of Science,' 'Unity of Principle,' and 'Unity of Law,' to usurp too much on the understanding. Professor Powell seems to us to give undue force to such phrases; which, strictly examined, have no counterpart or reality in our actual knowledge. It is true that there is various high authority for their use, as for that of language analogous in effect. Humboldt, in several passages of his 'Cosmos,' and, at an earlier period, D'Alembert and Laplace, have sanctioned the general conception, though not defining it sufficiently for any practical application beyond that attempt at generalisation just noticed; and which would have existed, even if no such mysterious word as 'Unity' had been used to signify the ultimate end in view. We readily admit it

as probable or certain, that numerous facts, hitherto insulated or anomalous, and even whole classes of phenomena unexplained by science, will hereafter be submitted to common and known laws. And we further believe that many laws themselves, now of partial application, will hereafter merge in others of higher scope and generality. We shall speedily have to notice certain cases where this amalgamation has so far advanced as to furnish an entirely new basis for research, scarcely seen or anticipated before. But admitting what we have full right and reason to presume, that this concentration may be carried yet much further, still the attainment or even the conception of unity, in any strict sense of the word, lies indefinitely beyond, shrouded by an obscurity which words may seek to penetrate, but which human intellect can reach only in that one sublime sense of the unity of the Divine Creating Power. We may reduce to a small number the many forms of matter which are elementary to our present knowledge; we may show the identity of certain forces, hitherto deemed elementary, by their mutual convertibility; we may accept the phrase of Laplace, 'Les phénomènes de la Nature ne sont que les résultats mathématiques d'un petit nombre de lois immuables;' and yet we shall never prove that there is but one kind of matter, or one nature of force, or that a single law governs all the phenomena around us. To put forward, therefore, the phrase and conception of the 'Unity of Science' as the final term of our labours, is to inflict a metaphysical issue upon them, for which there is no warranty either in reason or practical use. Bishop Berkeley has somewhere spoken of ultimate ratios in mathematics as the 'ghosts of departed quantities.' With like reason we might call the unity of some of our modern philosophers the 'ghost of departed pluralities;' having this quality of ghosthood, moreover, that there is nothing truly tangible or substantial about it.

We have dwelt thus much on these preliminary topics because, while they indicate what may be considered the exaggerations and excesses of theory, they show at the same time that spirit and propensity of modern science of which we have before spoken; and which, duly regulated, has been the source of all its high attainments. We now proceed to such details as may best illustrate this spirit in its application to different branches of science; selecting, amidst the multitude of examples, those especially which involve either some new physical principle or some new method of physical inquiry. It has been said by one who could well estimate the value of the latter, 'La connoissance de la méthode, qui a guidé l'homme de génie, n'est pas moins utile au progrès de la science que ses décou-

‘vertes.’ A new method is often indeed in itself the greatest discovery, and betokening the highest genius in him to whom it is due.

In dealing with this wide subject, the first and most material division is that between the forces acting *on* or *in* matter; and the various forms of matter, inorganic or organic, so acted upon. With full admission of the difficulty of defining the abstract nature of matter and force, and their mutual relations in the universe, this distinction is still the only one which our intelligence can apprehend, or practically apply to the objective phenomena ever present and active around us.

In regard to matter and force it may undoubtedly be affirmed, that all questions as to their nature become more difficult and abstruse in proportion as we generalise and reduce them to their simplest terms. With respect to force, more especially, the most eminent philosophers of our time, while declining any metaphysical definition, have been constrained to adopt new methods of regarding and describing it, in those various actions upon or through matter which testify to its presence and energy. Centres of force (an expression due to Boscovich in its scientific use), lines of force, polar force, &c., are terms found necessary to express the several modes of force in action, irrespectively of all questions as to its abstract nature, or especial relations to matter. Under the gradual adoption of this new language, there has been a corresponding abandonment of phrases, more hypothetical in themselves, and far less fitted to aid the progress of scientific inquiry. As such we may denote that expression, current even in some of our best systematic works, of the ‘imponderable substances or forms of matter;’ which, in including heat, light, and electricity, makes assumptions wholly unproved; while in excluding gravitation, chemical, mechanical, and vital forces from the same category, it affirms a distinction which we do not absolutely know to exist in any of these cases, and which certainly does not exist in some of them. For the notion of an *imponderable element* (if notion it can be called) that of a *mode of motion of matter* might probably in each case be more truly as well as advantageously substituted. Science, it may fairly be said, is constantly tending to a better and closer form of logic in these matters; and simple induction from facts, unfettered by names and prior notions, is here, as elsewhere the best guide to all ulterior discovery.

The great problem respecting force, in the most general conception of it as a motive power on matter, is involved in the question, whether it can ever be really lost or extinguished?

— whether the seeming cessation and limits to its action are not merely conversions or translations of power, testified in other forms and effects of material change? Most persons, seemingly justified by experience, would answer at once that any force has ceased to exist, when the motions or other effects it induces on matter are no longer present. The question, however, is one which rises far above the mere evidence of the senses. Vaguely suggested at different periods, it has been adopted in a definite shape by the philosophers of our own time; forced upon them, we may say, by the course and character of recent discovery. It is the question which forms the main topic of Mr. Faraday's lecture, just referred to, on the 'Conservation of Force;' and we willingly quote a few lines, both from the intrinsic weight of all that comes from this source, and as expressing what we consider to be the growing conviction of all who have grappled with this great problem of modern science.

'To admit that force may be destructible or can altogether disappear, would be to admit that matter could be uncreated, for we know matter only by its forces.' 'Agreeing with those who admit the conservation of force to be a principle in physics as large and sure as that of the indestructibility of matter, or the invariability of gravity, I think that no particular idea of force has a right to unlimited or unqualified acceptance, that does not include *assent* to it; and also, to *definite amount* and *definite disposition of the force*, either in one effect or another, for these are necessary consequences. Therefore I urge, that the conservation of force ought to be admitted as a physical principle in all our hypotheses, whether partial or general, regarding the actions of matter.'

This question was forced upon the attention of men of science by the very nature of their recent researches, and the remarkable doctrine based upon them, which is now developing itself under the title of the 'Correlation of Physical Forces;' a description modest as well as apposite of a theory, which, if matured, as we think it likely to be, into full truth, will give new foundation and guidance to the whole course of physical inquiry. In the work of Mr. Grove, bearing this title, and prefixed to our article, we have the first and most able exposition of this doctrine. Partial suggestions of it, both in England and Germany, had already been derived from the results of experiment; but we owe to Mr. Grove its distinct enunciation as a physical principle, and the illustration of this principle by instances drawn from his own researches and those of others, which give it all the characters of a new physical law. Eminent in his own profession, he has made to himself a high and merited reputation in science, by his acute application of experiment to

some of its most profound problems, and by the bold but precise logic with which he draws his inductions. His work, of which the third edition is before us, is remarkable for its clearness and simplicity of style—qualities valuable in all scientific writings, and essential on subjects like those here treated of.

By the term correlation, as applied to physical forces, Mr. Grove means to convey the general idea of *reciprocal production*,—that is, that any force capable of producing another, may reciprocally be produced by it. But the principle here involved, as well as the wide scope of the doctrine conveyed by these terms, will be better understood by taking correlation to express generally those relations of forces which render them mutually and constantly convertible—one form or manifestation of force generating another, so as to bring together into the same series of effects, physical actions and changes seemingly the most remote and dissimilar. Thus, to take a familiar but striking instance—the same single electrical current from a voltaic battery is capable in its circuit of evolving heat and light, of creating magnets, of producing mechanical force, of violently affecting the nervous and muscular organisation, and of inducing, by decomposition or combination, the most powerful chemical changes, simply according to the nature of the different material objects which the experimentalist interposes in the circuit, so as to subject them to this current of power. Here then (gravitation excepted) we find all the great natural forces, of which we have present knowledge, evolved from a single source; and that source, be it remarked, a chemical change of affinities, giving origin to the electrical current, and thereby affording fresh proof of the reciprocity of actions alluded to above. One form of force disappears as another is evolved.

We might give, had we space for them, many other curious instances of this reciprocity of relation, as manifested by the several forces of heat, electricity, magnetism, mechanical power, and chemical affinity. One we may select, as an example of beautiful contrivance as well as striking results. By a certain combination of apparatus, in which light, acting through the daguerreotype, was the initiating force, Mr. Grove obtained, first the *chemical action* upon the plate; thence a current of *electricity* circulating through wires; next *magnetism* by a coil of these wires; then the production of *heat*, testified by the delicate helix of Bregnet; and finally, of *motion*, shown by the needles of the galvanometer. Instances of this kind, indeed, are rapidly multiplying, since the correlation and convertibility of forces has been recognised as a principle and applied to research. They are derived not solely from recent experiment, but even more

frequently and fruitfully from phenomena already familiar to us as facts, but waiting for their illustration the happy induction now at length attained.

The beauty of this principle, however, is not limited to the expression of the reciprocity or mutual convertibility of the physical forces with which we are dealing. There is much reason to believe in a further correlation as regards their equivalents of power, or measurable quantitative effects. Though this generalisation is still far from complete, numerous cases occur where it is attested by the results of very exact experiment. The discoveries of Faraday have furnished some of the most striking examples of constant quantitative relation between electrical power and chemical actions and changes. The researches of Dulong, Petit, and Neumann show very remarkable relations between chemical affinity and heat, in proving that the specific heats of certain substances, compound as well as simple, when multiplied by their chemical equivalents, give a constant quantity as the product. And again, the experiments recently made by Mr. Joule and Professor W. Thomson, on the mutual convertibility of heat and dynamical force, go far to demonstrate the remarkable fact that, in whatever way mechanical force is employed to produce heat, the same amount of heat is produced by the same amount of force. We doubt not that the progress of science will so multiply the number of these instances of quantitative relation, as ultimately to submit them to some general law, as well as to that practical application which is the most certain test of truth.

It will be noticed that we have not hitherto spoken of gravitation as a physical force; though it is the one with which we are most familiar in every incident of life, and to which we look as the most universal agent upon matter, as well in the globe we inhabit, as in the innumerable worlds surrounding us in space. We place it apart from other physical forces, because, while thus familiar to our senses in its effects, it is to our deeper meditation the most mysterious as well as vast and sublime of the powers which act in the universe. Human genius has discovered and mathematically defined its laws. By knowledge of these laws, human science has been carried, and is ever penetrating further, beyond our own planetary system; while within this system, they have enabled us to predict events in time and space, and to define physical conditions of the planets and their satellites, seemingly inaccessible by man. With all this knowledge and perpetual application of the power, of its nature and essence we are utterly ignorant. Science has dealt with its effects only, without really approaching a step nearer to the cause, than when

Newton declared that he must leave to the consideration of his readers the question whether the agent producing gravity was material or not. Hypotheses have grown up — such as that of *gravific atoms* permeating all space, of Le Sage — or the *residual force* theory of Mosotti, connecting gravity with cohesive attractions—but none which satisfy fully the exigencies of the case. The research is even made more difficult by the simplicity and invariability of the power in question. It controls or modifies the other forces acting on matter, but has no such relations to them as they have to one another—no reciprocal production or mutual convertibility; nor the *duality of action* belonging peculiarly to the electrical and magnetic forces; nor lines of propagation and polarisation, such as we recognise in light and heat; nor those molecular changes manifested in acts of chemical affinity. Whether any—or if any, through what avenues,—closer approach may hereafter be made to the solution of this great problem of gravity, we cannot here inquire. But in speaking of the forces which act upon matter, it was impossible to omit this the most universal of all—innate and incorporate, we might almost say, in matter itself.

Nor can we rightly avoid in this place some allusion to the equally abstruse subject (though rendered so by very different causes) of the mutual relations of the physical and vital forces—a topic handled with great ability by Dr. Carpenter, in a paper in the ‘Philosophical Transactions’ a few years ago, and more recently in the systematic works of this physiologist. Without plunging into the depths of this question, we may say that the tendency of all recent research has been to impugn the doctrine of vitality, both in animal or vegetable life, as a distinct force or power; and to merge its alleged functions, whether of organisation, maintenance or reproduction, in those same physical forces which act on the inorganic matter of the world around us. That this is true to a certain extent cannot indeed be doubted. That heat and light, and more especially the former, are intimately concerned in all the phenomena of vital organisation, is a fact familiar to us from a thousand examples. The researches of Liebig and others have shown how very closely chemical processes are engaged—even under the strict law of definite proportions—in all the great processes of the highest animal life, assimilation, secretion, respiration, animal heat, &c.; while the discoveries of Matteucci and Du Bois Raymond have demonstrated the curious and exquisitely subtle relations which exist between electricity and the nervous and muscular functions; not indeed proving the absolute identity of electricity with the ner-

vous element of force, but countenancing this view beyond all prior expectation.

In thus discussing the relation of the physical and vital forces as applied especially to man, we continually approach that line, hard indeed to discriminate or define, which separates the mere vital or automatic acts from the proper functions of mind, consciousness, thought, feeling, and volition. On this debateable land we encounter at once the old questions, so long the subject of philosophical speculation, and destined, as far as we can see, ever so to remain. Human science on this point is as feeble as it was two thousand years ago, and beset by exactly the same difficulties. We have just been speaking of forces which are correlated and measurable in their effects. We come here to powers and functions *wholly incommensurable* either with material qualities or physical forces; yet so linked with both under the present conditions of existence, that not even personal consciousness, the best and surest of all teachers, can mark any certain boundary line. Those who have sought to decipher or define these proximate relations of matter and mind have but substituted barren words for the realities of knowledge. Mr. Baden Powell himself, while stretching the domain of physical causes to the total phenomena of animal life, yet finds a limit here; and somewhat abruptly closes his argument by observing that the assertion of a moral and spiritual nature in man refers essentially to 'a *different order of things*, apart from and transcending any material ideas whatsoever.' To some such conclusion, however expressed, all must come who honestly and rationally approach this question.

We have dwelt thus long on the subject of the physical forces — the 'imponderables' of former systems — as illustrating at once a great doctrine of modern science, and the general spirit of philosophy at the present time. We are far, however, from having exhausted the subject. Questions crowd round and converge upon it from every side; some of them so subtle in kind that we might well call them metaphysical, had we not in some sort repudiated this term. Such are, to state briefly a few of them, the question whether forces can exist, except in absolute connexion with matter? — whether they may, intelligibly and consistently with phenomena, be regarded as molecular actions, or modes of motion in matter? — whether (to revert to a question urged before) they can ever by possibility be annulled or even rendered latent? — whether, in admitting this constant combination of forces, we do not virtually admit a *constant amount* of force, variously manifested, to be always present in the universe? — and whether, in such case, we can ever rightly

speak of an *initial force*, otherwise in the sense of those acts of creation which are the beginning of all things? All these and other like questions belong to the philosophy of our day; some of them shadowed out in the hypotheses of antiquity; now approached through the safer avenues of experiment and sound induction. How far these may carry us to the future solution of the problems suggested we cannot here stop to inquire.

In passing from the province of forces acting on matter, to that of matter thus acted on, we have yet to traverse another debatable ground, on which science is seeking to find some firm footing, as well in explanation of known phenomena as for purposes of further research. We allude here to the question regarding the *physical condition of space itself*—of those inter-planetary and inter-sidereal distances, some of them hardly measurable by numbers, and such as no efforts of mind can compass or conceive. Are we to regard this vastness of space as void of matter—a mere vacuum, through which the numberless worlds we see as stars or planets are dispersed? Or may we better contemplate it, as pervaded throughout by some material medium, though so rare and attenuated, that no form of matter of which our senses are cognisant, can rightly interpret it to our reason? The question can no longer be argued in that mystical language of ‘nature abhorring a vacuum,’ which satisfied the demands of an earlier philosophy; nor can we evade it by the adoption of terms such as *ether*, *ethereal medium*, &c., which, though sanctioned by some great names, go little further than to shelter a vague and incomplete solution. Modern science seeks urgently for proof that matter, in some condition, does exist throughout space; and in such continuity, however rare it be, that forces may be transmitted *by or through* the medium thus afforded. Two great powers, gravitation and light, undoubtedly reach us from the most remote regions of space. There is presumption, though not certainty, that heat is associated with light in its origin, as a concomitant, if not convertible force. More doubt exists as to the transmission through space of the electric or magnetic powers; but many facts of recent observation tend to authenticate this belief. How then are these forces, or any of them, transmitted to and fro in the universe? If we say that the tides of the ocean are raised, or the perturbations of a planet produced, without any intervening medium between the bodies affected and those affecting them, we quit the domain of physics altogether, and put an abrupt end to inquiry. Newton has expressed himself strongly on this matter, in saying, ‘To suppose that one body may act upon another at a distance, through

' a vacuum, without the mediation of any thing else, by and through which their action and force may be conveyed from one to another, is to me so great an absurdity that I believe no man who has in philosophical matters a competent faculty of thinking, can ever fall into it.' The conviction which his conception of gravity impressed thus strongly on Newton's mind, is enforced upon us not less cogently by the undulating theory of light. This theory—based on mathematical proof and capable not merely of explaining phenomena before known, but of *predicting* others evolved by later research—presumes of necessity the existence of an elastic medium, whatever its nature, through which these undulations are transmitted. We say of *necessity*, because it is logically thus to our reason. Not solely on the analogy of air and other elastic media, but as the only conception we can form to the mind of undulation singly considered, the presence of a medium is essential to its existence and effects. And this fully recognised, the inferences become of magnificent kind. The progressive retardation of Encke's comet, and the aspects of the zodiacal light, afford presumption of such material media existing within our own solar system; but the argument we have just stattd, carries us far beyond this limit, to every part of that sidereal and nebular space from which light ever reaches the eye of man.

In coming finally to those several sciences which deal with matter in its more recognised forms, we must once again repeat that our object is simply that of indicating the spirit and scope of modern science, as illustrated by its new objects and methods, and by the high attainments at which it has arrived. Volumes would be needed to give even an approximate idea of the particular discoveries, whether from experiment or observation, which have conduced to these attainments. In the hasty view we are taking, we can but notice such as are most striking in character and results. Nor are we called upon to do this methodically; since, as we have before mentioned, one of the most eminent successes of our time is that of having brought all the branches of physical science into closer connexion and subordination to more general laws; and in illustrating these new connexions, examples converge and crowd upon us from sources seemingly the most remote.

Humboldt, in his *Cosmos*, has rightly given to astronomy—' the science of the universe without'—the first place in his great picture of physical knowledge. So much has lately been written on this science—the highest glory, it may well be deemed, of the human intellect—that we need only allude to a

few of its more recent attainments; not surpassing indeed those discoveries which we owe to the genius of an anterior time, yet so extending the doctrine of universal gravitation in the variety and refinement of its applications, that new grandeur is given to this great law of nature. We may take one or two examples, among many that offer themselves, from our own planetary system; where this power is more within our cognisance, both in its simple effects and in those complex perturbations of orbits, which have taxed, but not overcome, the efforts of our most illustrious mathematicians. The first instance — one of those familiar to the world for the moment, but speedily forgotten — is a discovery made by means of these very perturbations. The movements of Uranus, then (1846) supposed the most remote planet of our system, were found to be disturbed by some external influence not referrible to causes *within* its orbit, as could be shown, but due to some material attraction from without. Another planet alone could answer these conditions. Science set itself to work in the persons of two eminent mathematicians, Adams and Leverrier — the position of the disturbing body was determined by them simultaneously, but independently — telescopes followed their guidance, and Neptune was added to the number of our planets. The method of discovery here has higher interest than the fact itself; though now but one of numerous instances in science, where results can be predicted with hardly less certainty than if attained and present to the senses.

A second example we may cite, in proof of the exactness, or even *delicate minuteness*, with which modern astronomy pursues the vast objects of its science. The complex irregularities of the moon's motions have long put to test all the resources of analysis, and are scarcely even yet fully submitted to our knowledge. Chiefly, of course, they depend on the relative position and distances of the sun and earth; and Laplace had shown not only the secular acceleration of mean motion, produced by the increasing excentricity of the earth's orbit, but also a small irregularity depending on the spheroidal figure of the earth itself. His suggestion that the oblateness of the earth's spheroid might reciprocally be determined by this irregularity of the moon's motion led Burg to a calculation, the results of which closely tallied with the best measurements and pendulum observations. Very recently new and more delicate causes of lunar disturbance have been indicated, as depending on the action of the planet Venus; first, indirectly, by perturbing the motion of the earth, altering its distance from the sun, and thereby affecting the motion and position of the moon during periods of

120 years; secondly, by a minute disturbance arising from the *direct* action of Venus on the moon itself. In all these cases the theory accords with the phenomena observed, and this accordance well illustrates the perfection of use which the great law of gravitation has now attained.

In passing the bounds of our own system — *narrow*, we may call them in relation to what lies beyond — we lose in great part the guidance of this law; though retaining such proof of its equal and probably similar operation in the most distant regions of space, as almost to force upon us the conclusion (warranted indeed by other considerations) that motion is universal and constant in all matter — that nothing in the universe around us is at absolute rest. To prove the continuous movement of the solar system in space, with the direction and rate of its motion — to confirm this wonderful fact by the discovery of the proper and absolute motions of other stars — to determine, by parallactic observation of incredible delicacy, the distances of certain of the fixed stars, and to measure these distances by the *years* which light takes to traverse them — to demonstrate, among the many thousand double or multiple stars now discovered, those orbits and periods of revolution which obey the same law that brought Newton's apple to the ground — to *gauge* by refined processes our own nebula of the Milky Way — to discover and assign the place of more than 3000 other nebulae, resolving many of them into systems of stars, and by admirable methods obtaining some approximate idea of their distances — these have been among the undertakings of modern sidereal astronomy; admirably fulfilled by the eminent men who have devoted themselves to this science, the two Herschels, Struve, Bessel, Airy, Argelander, Peters, &c. Sublime even in their simplest enunciation, these problems will be seen to involve results as to space and time which border on infinity; and as such illustrate well those arduous efforts and aspirations of modern science which it is our especial object to indicate.

Though not easy in a science like this to set limits to its future scope, yet is it difficult to suppose any ulterior discovery which can do more than aid in filling up this vast outline. If any new law is discovered in our own system, we might perhaps presume it to be one relating to the rotation of the planets on their axes — an important series of facts arbitrary to our present knowledge, but doubtless due to determinate physical causes, and therefore fairly open to physical research. It is *possible*, seeing the distances which some comets reach in their aphelia, that another planet may exist even beyond Neptune: — the discovery, if ever made, would probably be so

through the observed perturbations of Neptune itself. In the sidereal system of which we are a part, much yet remains for future completion. Nothing is more wonderful than the phenomena, periodical or otherwise, of the variable stars, which are now largely catalogued in our books. Ages may be required to gather any certain induction from our observations upon them. But ages are the field in which the astronomer works; and each present fact, duly recorded, ministers to the higher knowledge, which is the harvest of the future. The research into the proper motions of the stars, already noticed, is sure to be greatly extended, and may possibly connect itself in the end (as Mädler has already sought to connect it) with the discovery of some centre of attraction and movement to the whole sidereal system. If such central body or point in space were ever ascertained, it would still be simply an expression of the law of universal gravitation; but how sublime an expression, and how wonderful as a result of the genius and labours of man!

But the limit does not lie even here. The telescope of the astronomer, enlarged in its powers and more perfect in all its appliances, is continually engaged amongst those other sidereal or nebular systems, the remoteness of which goes far to express all that man can ever understand of the infinite in space. In a former article, already referred to (No. 208., Art. 6.), we have spoken more at large on this subject. Whoever has inspected those admirable *portraits* of nebulae, as seen through Lord Rosse's great reflector, will comprehend in part the magnitude of this research, and of the problems it puts before us. The aspects and multiplicity of the spiral nebulae, though hardly sanctioning the notion of any new law of matter, yet well warrant the belief in some common but unknown cause conducing to this singular effect. A matter of still higher interest is suggested to us in the question, whether there exist in these nebulous lights, or elsewhere in space, matter not yet condensed or shapen into forms — the material, it may be, of future worlds, and in different stages of progressive concentration, but still not aggregated as such. The resolution into clusters of stars, by high telescopic power, of many nebulae before thought irresolvable, alters the degree of presumption, but does not settle the question. The comparison of different nebulae, as they now exist, and of their several relations to centres or points of greatest condensation, would seem the sole probable avenue to further knowledge; since any changes in the figure, condensation, luminousness, or other aspects of these nebular systems must, upon every analogy of the more proximate parts of the heavens, occupy such immense periods of time as to place them beyond

all present reach; and we know too little of the duration of our own species on the earth to venture on any assumption thus remote in its fulfilment.

These questions as to nebulous matter in space are deeply interesting, *retrospectively*, as well as *prospectively*, in time. Few subjects have so keenly exercised speculation of late as the hypothesis, first sanctioned by Laplace, that our own solar system, with its central sun, planets, moons, and comets, has its origin in the concentration of the matter of a nebulous sphere in successive zones; each several planet being formed by the condensation of vapour at these successive limits in the plane of a common equator; and the satellites being similarly formed from the atmospheres of the planets. It does not annul this theory to admit that there are great difficulties in conceiving the cause of such aggregation of matter at certain points, and of the permanent movements impressed on the bodies thus formed. These difficulties, whatever they be, have not prevented its eager appropriation by philosophers who hold the doctrine of progressive development according to certain determinate laws, in the creation both of the inorganic and organic world. They find a basis for the evolution or transmutations they suppose, in this hypothesis of the nebular origin of suns and planets; and their argument would be plausible were the hypothesis itself capable of being verified. How far presumptive evidence may reach in future towards such verification we do not venture to say; but the sources of fresh knowledge are ever opening in this as in other directions of research. The more careful study of cometary phenomena; of the numerous planetoids revolving in excentric orbits between Mars and Jupiter; of those meteors, some of which have lately been recognised as periodical in occurrence; and of the aerolites, which impinge in mass upon the earth, can hardly fail to settle some questions as to the occupation of planetary space. How curious, for example, the inference to be drawn from the composition of these falling stones, brought to us undoubtedly from far beyond our own atmosphere, or, as Laplace boldly phrases his belief, '*des profondeurs de l'espace céleste!*' Of the various ingredients they are found to contain, every one is familiar to us upon the surface of the earth we inhabit. They represent, indeed, fully one-third of those forms of matter which are still simple or elementary to our knowledge; though under different aspects and forms of combination. Here then we have a sort of *material ingress* into the regions of inter-planetary space; and presumption as to a common origin, though under different modes of aggregation, not merely of those fragmentary masses which

casually reach us, but of the great planets also, which move with ourselves in orderly and ordered course around the sun.

We are tempted to add one or two other instances here, illustrating the manner in which modern science — resting upon the uniformity of laws, whatever the scale of their operation — has brought evidence to bear upon these vast astronomical questions from the most minute manipulations with matter here below. The happy idea occurred to M. Plateau of Ghent of suspending globules of oil within water, rendered exactly of the same specific gravity by addition of alcohol, so that the globules should be wholly exempt from the action of gravity, or other extrinsic force, and free to take any position or motions impressed upon them. By means of a small metallic disk and wires rotatory movements of various velocity and direction were produced in the spherical globules of oil, thus suspended in water; making them to assume many conditions closely allied to planetary configuration; — to become spheroids flattened at the poles; — to throw off smaller globules having movements both of revolution and rotation; — and even rings like those which Saturn shows to our telescopes. These experiments, repeated by Faraday and others, are as valid in the way of inference as they would be were the scale of operation a thousand times greater. And the same may be said of the second instance we have before us, in those beautiful instruments and inventions of Foucault, Piazzì Smyth, Wheatstone, &c., illustrating the principle of the stability and composition of rotatory motions, and thereby expounding with admirable simplicity the great phenomena of the precession of the equinoxes, and of the earth's rotation on its axis. The *gyroscope* of Foucault, set into action, and placed on a table, shows even in a few minutes, by the angular deviation from its plane of rotation, the movement the earth has made in this short space of time — a demonstration almost startling from its simplicity and grandeur. The instrument is one of consummate beauty in its other applications; and in the more compound form which Professor Smyth has recently given to it, well indicates the perfection such means have attained in furtherance of scientific research.

We have lingered somewhat long on the subject of astronomy, partly from the striking exemplification it affords of the spirit and aims of modern science; partly from the specialty of its objects, as detached by distance from those relations which so closely connect the sciences treating of matter on our own globe. But though thus distant in space, the vast masses moving in the heavens, and especially the Sun, are variously associated with the matter of the earth, through the elementary forces,

of which we have already so largely spoken. Here indeed we come again into contact with those arduous questions, where mathematical aids are scantily supplied, and few certainties yet attained; but where new facts and presumptions unceasingly offer themselves, the foundation and materials of more exact knowledge. Omitting gravitation, of which we have sufficiently spoken as a power apart from the rest, there comes that wonderful element of light, blending itself, as we have seen, with heat, electricity, magnetism, and chemical affinity, in such close correlation of action that we can scarcely dis sever its continuity, or detach these physical forces from connexion with that great source whence light itself chiefly emanates. The solar beam, as unfolded and analyzed in the spectrum, is in truth the most marvellous and mysterious object of the physical world; comprising in itself whole volumes of science, and problems that might put to trial the boldest theorist. The poetry of Milton, sublime though it be, fails to reach the reality of these great attributes of light, as evolved from a single beam, by simple refraction in passing through a glass prism. It is an analysis of exquisite order and perfection; in which not only are the several colours separated in the same constant proportions, with the intervention of numerous dark lines equally constant in their character; but rays of heat and of chemical power appear severally also at opposite extremities of the spectrum, partially interblended with those of colour, but in greatest intensity beyond the visible coloured limits of the spectrum. We are now speaking only of the simplest relations of the solar light to terrestrial matter; and without any immediate reference to the astonishing phenomena included under the undulatory theory of light, which, though attested by mathematicians, and interpreted by numbers, wholly transcend the powers of human conception. We allude, but cannot here do more than allude, to those formulæ of space and time expressing the amplitude and frequency of the undulations, and their variations for the several colours and rays of the spectrum; and the whole series of phenomena of interference, polarisation, diffraction, &c.—discoveries which have given or added lustre to the names of Young, Fresnel, Arago, Brewster, Cauchy, Herschel, Hamilton, and other philosophers scarcely less eminent in this great inquiry.

A word or two we must add here as to one relation—simple in fact, but not familiar to thought—which light establishes between man and the universe around. The total science of astronomy belongs in origin to this element alone. Extinguish those vivid points or bright surfaces of light, which give splendour to the midnight sky;—deprive the astronomer of the

feebler rays and fainter gleams which stars and nebulae, invisible to the eye, bring before his telescope;—and you annihilate at once that science which can predict eclipses centuries beforehand; determine the orbits and return of comets; measure the distances of the fixed stars, and the motion of our own sun and solar system in the universe of space; and penetrate into systems of worlds beyond, where relative degrees of light become the solitary evidence of form and distance. Nowhere are these relations of astronomy to light so admirably illustrated as in ‘Arago’s Analysis of the Life and Labours of the elder Herschel,’ recently republished in the collection of his works.

The evidences connecting electricity and magnetism, as forces, with the Sun and other bodies of our system, are of course different and inferior to those which establish the relations of light. Yet they are now continually becoming more numerous and significant. Whoever has seen the star of pure and intense light which bursts forth on the approach of the charcoal points completing the circuit of a voltaic battery; or the *flood of light* thence poured by reflection over wide and distant spaces, cannot but suspect that the new ‘fountain’ thus opened to the eyes of men (and certainly not destined to remain an idle and valueless gift of science) may be the same in source and qualities as that higher fountain which diffuses light and heat over the whole planetary system. Sir J. Herschel, who ever makes his highest speculations subordinate to cautious induction, has assigned strong reasons for believing the sun to be in a permanently excited electrical state. The various phenomena of the tails of comets he considers as not to be explained, but by supposing a *repulsive force*, acting from the central body, which electricity alone could furnish. ‘The sun electrically charged would induce opposite ‘states in the two hemispheres of day and night on the earth,’ is the expression applied to the effect of this solar condition upon our own globe*; and if we suppose, as may fairly be done, variations in the intensity of this electrical state, we acquire a probable cause for many periodical or secular variations which have hitherto embarrassed science. We allude especially here, to changes in the intensity, declination, and inclination of the magnetic force—that extraordinary power which we are now led to refer to particular conditions of electricity, in its con-

* These passages, with others equally remarkable, will be found in Sir J. Herschel’s volume on the ‘Nebulae and Double Stars of the ‘Southern Hemisphere;’ a volume in which the tabular results of his vast labours of observation are intermingled with some of the highest speculations to which the human mind has yet *legitimately* reached.

nexion with material media. General Sabine, whom the labours of a life have rendered our highest authority on magnetic phenomena, has recently, through his papers to the Royal Society, furnished full evidence, from the exact coincidence in time of magnetic changes or disturbances at remote parts of the globe, that these are due to *causes from without*, irrespective of any local conditions of the earth or atmosphere; while in pointing out the correspondence of such periodical variations with the several conditions of the sun, he has shown a direct relation of these phenomena, which we cannot refuse to admit. Diurnal or annual changes, subject to this relation, we may indeed in part comprehend; but it needs new elements of knowledge to link together in theory, as General Sabine and Schwabe have seemingly done in fact, the maxima and minima of diurnal magnetic variation, with the greater or smaller number of dark spots present on the sun's surface; — a coincidence expressed, as far as the proof now goes, by periods of ten to eleven years; but one so extraordinary in character, that we are bound still to await other similar recurrences before finally admitting it into the records of discovery.

Meanwhile the Moon also has been found, by delicate observations and averages carefully collected, to exercise a magnetic influence on the earth,—the needle expressing to human eye certain small variations which strictly correspond with the lunar hour angle. The fact has its peculiar interest in indicating, and this not vaguely, a similar influence throughout the whole planetary system, and possibly far beyond. The magnetic conditions and changes of the earth itself come into direct testimony here; so general and strictly coincident over its surface, as to give us assurance that the total globe is in a definite magnetic state; and capable through this state of affecting other worlds, as well as the little needle which man makes his index here of this mysterious force.

From these vast and remote actions in space around us, we come to those affecting the matter, whether inorganic or living, of the earth on which we dwell. The same great physical forces are still in unceasing action here; with more diversity of effect from the differences of the material acted upon, and from the reflected influence of organic life upon the matter from which it is engendered. We have already spoken of the impossibility of giving more than a glance over this wide field; but such cursory view will suffice to show the magnitude of the objects attained in each science, and the energy which is ever active to forward the work—*τα ἡμέτερα ἐς τέλος ἐξεργάζεσθαι*.

On one subject, indeed, that of Electricity, though beyond any other prolific of great discoveries, we need say very little, having in a recent review of M. De la Rive's admirable work described its progress, and the wonderful results thence obtained, as well for pure science, as for the practical uses of man. Yet even amidst these marvels of human attainment, it must needs be avowed that we are still at the very alphabet of electrical science. The terms of *positive* and *negative*, though required for practical use and illustration, are little better than barren phrases as respects any real explanation of the phenomena; while the whole subject of *induction* and *conduction*, so essential to a perfect theory of electrical action, is still awaiting more certain and complete conclusions than have yet been obtained. Some single and simple observation may, perchance, furnish the truths desired; and in the very beautiful experiments recently recorded in the Bakerian Lecture of Mr. Gassiot, we willingly recognise one of those various avenues through which research may reasonably be directed towards this object. Nor can we do more here than allude to the discoveries, scarcely less remarkable than those of electricity, which concern the material phenomena of heat. Some of them we have already noticed in their connexion or correlation with the functions of the other elementary forces. But there are many besides, due to the various labours of Melloni, Forbes, Herschel, Seebeck, Clausius, Tyndall, &c., which singularly tend to confirm this connexion, and to offer other modes of access to those higher laws of force and motion, which we have denoted as the ultimate aim of all philosophy.

If seeking to denote in a few words the most striking characteristic of modern science as directed to matter, we should come at once to the principle of Molecular action, in its present application to physical research. Through this doctrine has been made man's deepest inroad into the secrets of the natural world. No single principle is so variously applicable to every branch of knowledge; none has done so much to promote discovery, or to authenticate and give the form and force of law to the results obtained. And yet it may be said to have had a lawless origin, and to have been long a play of human phantasy under the garb of science. We cannot here travel back to those early speculations on atoms which entered so largely into the staple of the ancient philosophy; and which the poetry of Lucretius has better consecrated to later times than the most subtle prose of the Greek philosophers. In every intermediate age, even the darkest, the atomic doctrine, in one form or other, has kept a certain hold on the minds of learned or speculative men;—a natural effect of the facility with which it lends itself

to any hypothesis, however crude, regarding matter and material phenomena. It was reserved for our own time to render it at once the subject and instrument of legitimate science; the foundation of laws next to mathematical in scope and exactness, and the most powerful of all aids to ulterior research.

This great achievement, for such it is, we owe mainly to Chemistry; and to John Dalton, the Quaker chemist, more appropriately than to any one besides. Close approaches had been made before to the doctrine of *definite proportions*, as represented by the molecules of matter in their combinations. Such anticipations are recorded in the case of every great discovery. But Dalton (speedily seconded indeed by other great chemists) first gave clear declaration to the principle; and illustrated its applications, mighty in their universality, with a simple sagacity belonging to the genius and habits of the man. The simplicity of his early experiments is, indeed, characteristic also of the manner in which many of the highest truths in science have been reached. Facts the most familiar to common observation, and thence disregarded by common intellects, have furnished better materials and suggestions for discovery than the most recondite theories.

It has been justly said by Sir J. Herschel that *number, weight, and measure* are the foundations of all exact sciences. The atomic doctrine has acquired from chemistry these conditions, which give it substance and certainty as a physical truth. When analysis and synthesis, carefully applied to compound bodies, disclosed a constant and definite proportion of the combining elements, and an equivalent or multiple ratio of parts in every chemical change, the requirements of number and weight and measure were all met by the discovery. Numbers became needful to express the proportion of the combining molecules; and in every case, even of the most complex chemical compounds, they have been found to fulfil this object so exactly, that combinations, yet unknown, may be predicted with assurance as the results of future research. The *absolute weight* of these elementary molecules is unresolved, and will probably ever remain so; but their *relative weight* is known to us through the proportions in which they severally combine; and this method is checked and counter-checked through such vast variety of compounds, that every chance of error is done away. Measure, the third condition proposed, is expressed chiefly in the combining volumes of gasses—invariable always, whether under the simple proportions shown by analysis, or the multiple measures of other chemical compounds.

Here then we have a great law, or group of laws, thoroughly

attested; of high generality; and proving, because based upon, that atomic or molecular constitution of matter which alone could afford such results. Whatever name we give to them, these atomic parts exist in all bodies, and determine by their own nature or arrangement the properties and functions of each. That they are minute beyond all human measure is proved, not only by the chemical relations just denoted, but also by those relations to heat, light, electricity, and mechanical force which experiment has demonstrated to us.

No hindrance to belief need exist on this score. When, even in organic or compound material structure, the microscope tells us, by computation, that two cubic feet of the Tripoli slate of Billin contain 140 billions of fossil infusoria,—that there are some millions of distinct fibres in the crystalline lens of the cod fish,—and that a single fungus (*Bovista Giganteum*) is composed of cellulæ far exceeding this number—we infer in reason, though not by comprehension, what the elementary molecules must be, so organised into living forms. Looking to simple inorganic matter, or what we suppose such, we have before us a recent memoir of Faraday's, on the 'Optical Phenomena of thin Gold Films and Gold Fluids,' where in one experiment a ruby tint, equal to that of a red rose, was given to a fluid by a quantity of gold not exceeding $\frac{1}{800,000}$ part of its weight. We quote another instance from this paper, as well expounding the spirit which prompts and guides these bold incursions into the atomic world. In seeking to procure the thinnest film of gold, *retaining continuity*, for the purpose of noting its effects on light passing through it, he obtained by a chemical action on gold leaf, films not exceeding $\frac{1}{3,500,000}$ of an inch in thickness. The number of vibrations in an inch of the red ray being 37,640, it follows that each such film cannot occupy more than a hundredth part of the vibration of light,—a deduction derived in such way from the premises as to compel belief, hard though it be for the imagination to follow it. But if in these, and other cases, the imagination fails, yet reason accepts this next to infinite divisibility of matter, and the conception of polarities and mutual relations of atoms so constituted, as the sole method of expounding the phenomena ever present around us.

Had we room here, we might fairly dwell on the astonishing results already derived from this new method of chemical inquiry, through the atomical combinations of matter; and those especially which bring new laws of action and combination into view; such as the doctrines of *isomorphism*, *atomic substitution*, *homologous series of compounds*, *compound radicals*, *catalysis*, &c.

which we owe to the genius and labours of Berzelius, Mitscherlich, Dumas, Liebig, Hoffman, and other chemists. Each one of these laws, thus based on the atomic doctrine, is a special example of that spirit of profound research which we are seeking to denote in the science of our day; while the growth of organic chemistry, in sequel to labours pursued on this principle, is perhaps the most wonderful of the results thence attained. No surer test of truth in any law than its power of predicting events or effects yet unknown. When, for instance, we find in the different series of organic acids, where every step of change is made in multiple ratios of arithmetic exactness, that certain void places left in the first construction of the series are afterwards filled up by the discovery of compounds answering *precisely* to the numerical conditions required, we see at once how much has been done towards the deciphering of this secret scroll of nature's innermost workings. Nor is the advancement limited to the simple discovery of what actually exists. The chemistry of our time, bold in all its aims, has succeeded, through this same law of quantitative proportions, not solely in filling up, by the *creation of new compounds*, the gaps thus deserted, but even yet further, in producing, by the processes of the laboratory, numerous substances absolutely identical with organic compounds, hitherto known to us only as the products of animal or vegetable life. A vast step we must admit it to be; yet subject to the remark, that whereas nature works primarily with the simple or inorganic material elements, the chemist can only elaborate these 'counterfeit presentments' from the dissolution and changes of organic compounds already in his hands. The difference here is greater than may appear at first sight; but there is no reason in theory why science should not eventually pass beyond the line and obliterate it.

While especially demonstrated in chemical force and affinities, the atomic theory is far from being limited in application to this single science. We have seen that the other great forces are known to us by their actions on and through matter,—such actions and changes, whether from light, heat, electricity, or dynamic force, giving foundation to the several physical sciences which bear these names. Correlated as they all are with chemical phenomena, we might expect some corresponding relation to that atomic constitution of bodies, from which modern chemistry has drawn its greatest discoveries. And accordingly we find numerous and striking proofs to this effect, furnished by those who are seeking to solve experimentally these high problems, and thereby to establish new connexions in the sciences, and laws common to all. We might take, as a

most instructive example, the various and beautiful phenomena of crystalline bodies in their relation to heat, light, and electricity. The crystal itself, whatever the matter composing it, must be regarded as a substance, the component molecules of which are compelled by a force or affinity (which we may *provisionally* call polarity) to assume certain definite positions, determining both the inner structure and outer form. The three forces just named all affect most curiously this molecular arrangement. Mitscherlich has shown that while octædral crystals expand equally in all directions from heat, other crystals, not in this group, change the measure of their angles with every change of temperature. He has further shown that great alterations may be effected by heat in the internal structure of crystals (as in the case of certain prismatic crystals evolving octædrons under exposure to the sun's heat), without affecting their solidity or altering their external form.

This latter fact, now attested in various ways, that molecular changes, transient or permanent, may occur within bodies while retaining what we call their solid state, is one of high interest, and scarcely enough regarded in its various applications to every part of physics. The familiarity of some of the instances disguises what is most curious and important in the inferences from them. The simple expansion of a metallic bar by heat involves an atomic change through its every part; less complex it may be than those changes of molecular arrangement within crystals, however produced, which affect the passage of light through them; but analogous in the main fact of the mobility of atoms, and their power of assuming new and definite position within a solid body. We know from recent experiments that an iron bar is sensibly elongated; and the elasticity of iron transiently, of steel permanently, altered by magnetization. We know further that the capacity of iron to conduct heat is variously modified under the electro-magnetic action. We have the certainty, from the effects manifested at its extremities, that every molecule in the wire of an electric telegraph, whatever its length, undergoes change at the moments of transmission or cessation of the electric force. Without stopping to inquire whether such changes may or may not be interpreted as a *tendency* to what we term fluidity, we clearly see in them a proof of the *individuality of atoms*; and very strong evidence that these molecules of matter, minute beyond conception though they be, are endowed individually with axes of motion or polarities, determining their mutual relations, and the changes they undergo when submitted to forces from without. Such conclusions, forced upon us by the simplest view of the subject, are

strikingly corroborated by the whole course of modern inquiry; and very especially in those sciences to which the actions of light, and of electricity or magnetism, upon matter give foundation. We might in truth affirm that the highest speculations and most arduous questions and researches in modern physics concentrate themselves upon this point. The most eminent discoveries of our own day involve these qualities and conditions of the elementary molecules of matter; while the number of problems yet unsolved render this the most fertile and capacious field for future labour. The time may come when molecular forces or affinities, now represented chiefly in chemical actions, may be reduced to a common principle with what we term *mechanical forces*. And if gravitation be ever submitted to some common law with other powers, such law will probably be founded on the nature and functions of these ultimate particles — the *σώματα ἀδιαίρετα* of ancient philosophy — the elements through which modern science works amidst the most profound mysteries of the natural world.

Our limits prohibit any details as to those numerous discoveries which illustrate this particular inquiry, or the more general progress of those sciences of optics, heat, and electricity which so variously and wonderfully interpret the relations of matter to the forces acting through or upon it. Some of these discoveries, simple and limited in their origin, have become volumes of new knowledge in their progress. Such are, for instance, the discovery of Oersted, on which depends the whole science of electro-magnetism; — the doctrine of electrolysis, as established by Faraday in strict fulfilment of the law of definite proportions and equivalents; — the still greater discovery of Faraday, that all matter, whatsoever its nature, solid, fluid, or gaseous, is affected in a determinate manner when placed within the sphere or lines of magnetic force; — the contemporaneous discovery by the same philosopher of the rotation of a beam of polarised light under the influence of magnetic force directed through glass of a certain texture, followed by those larger researches which establish relations between magnetic force and the intimate structure of crystalline bodies; — the whole science and exquisite art of photography; and the beautiful and still more recent experiments of Grove and Neipce, founded upon it, showing the direct action of light upon the molecules of matter to be far more universal, as well as more definite and lasting, than was before dreamt of by philosophy; — and the discovery of *allotropic states* in various substances, as phosphorus, oxygen, &c., where (as in the instance of the diamond and carbon) a total change of

physical properties is produced, the matter so changed retaining its exact identity of nature.

We name these few instances out of many equally remarkable; all expounding, in one form or other, the great principle of molecular action and relation, to the clear conception of which modern science owes so much of its success. Even the points still open to controversy, — such as the true nature of the distinction between pure magnetic and diamagnetic bodies, those which take position parallel to the line of magnetic force, or transversely to it, — are clearly seen to depend for solution on more exact knowledge of the modes of molecular aggregation, and their influence on the forces which traverse them. Again, we have the question, before noticed, as to the phenomena of electrical induction through air, glass, and other media — whether these are due to some unknown physical causes? or to molecular polarities and motions, far removed from all cognisance of the senses, but interpreted to our reason by the closest experimental analogies? Faraday has given the sanction of his opinion to this molecular view of the phenomena; and Grove has done much to strengthen and extend this important conclusion.

We have hitherto been speaking of matter generally, without regard to the various aspects under which it is known to us. For with all the refinements of modern analysis, there still remain about sixty substances *undecomposed*, and which must therefore be deemed simple or elementary to our present knowledge. Of these the largest proportion are what we term metallic bodies, and most of the additions recently made to the list of simple substances belong to this class; with the further curious specialty pertaining to several of them, that while perfectly distinct from all others in physical characters, they are hitherto known to exist in a few rare specimens only. Almost we might be tempted to surmise that they belong to the number of those materials of which *aërolites* seem to tell us that other worlds are made; and that they are present there much more largely than in the feeble representation of their existence on our own globe. Such suggestion, however, must be received simply as illustrating the manner in which modern science attaches facts already attained to problems yet unresolved; concentrating them as it were around common *foci*, towards which they ever more closely converge.

The great problem regarding these many modes or kinds of matter on our earth lies in the question, whether and how they may be lessened in number by reduction to certain elements, common to several or all? Whether, in other words, bodies simple to our present knowledge are actually compound in their

nature? Chemistry, it must be owned, has hitherto done little directly towards solving this question; the vast resources of analysis having tended to multiply elements upon us rather than to abridge their number. Some approach in this direction has, however, been made through the law of isomorphism; which, in showing relations of mutual substitution between certain elementary bodies, having other curious resemblance of physical properties, has led to their arrangement in groups; preparatory, it may be hoped, to some future discovery which will give a common basis to all the bodies thus related. The most remarkable of these groups is that comprising chlorine, iodine, and bromine. Arsenic and phosphorus, selenium and sulphur, are other examples of these combinations; to all which, in connexion with the law of definite proportions, the labours of the chemist are sedulously directed; not solely for instant results, but with the prospect continually before him of those higher truths, to which some one single discovery may perchance open the way. The present methods of chemical inquiry are peculiarly fitted to this *critical examination* of the simple bodies. Electricity, equally powerful and delicate as an instrument of analysis, has been, and must ever be, an especial aid — probably the most effective of all — in the prosecution of an object worthy of all the labour and genius that can be given to its attainment.

Oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen are the three elements which furnish what we may fairly call the *crucial problem* in this part of science. Embodying themselves with all other forms of matter by the most complex affinities, and in compounds of infinite variety, no art or force has yet succeeded in showing them to us singly otherwise than in the gaseous form. The powers of analysis, whether chemical or electrolytic, utterly fail when put to trial upon them. A recent discovery, indeed, has shown us oxygen under the new or allotropic form of ozone; but no analogous transformation has hitherto been effected on the two kindred elements. Mighty though the power and efficiency of this one is in every part of the natural world, we must avow a still deeper interest in the scientific fortunes of nitrogen, and a belief that it is fated to disclose still more to future discovery. Its history down to the present time has been one of paradox throughout. Known as a simple gas chiefly by its negative qualities, and in this state capable of direct union with only one or two bodies (as titanium and boron), nitrogen shows itself in combinations, otherwise effected, as one of the most strange and powerful elements with which chemistry has made us acquainted. We inhale it largely

with every breath, seemingly but as a diluent to the oxygen, with which it is mixed in our atmosphere. We take it into the system as a constituent of food, and find it forming an integral and essential part of the animal textures; while to compounds differing but in slight proportion of their elements, it imparts the character of the most virulent poisons. These incongruities, which might seem to render research more difficult, do in truth afford more ample materials and room for discovery. Certain approaches have already been made in this direction of inquiry; and we should wrong the spirit and resources of modern science were we to doubt its reaching yet much nearer towards the ultimate truth.

In passing thus cursorily over the sciences which deal with the various forms of matter in our globe, and the forces affecting them, we have said nothing of that science now become so vast in its objects and methods, which takes as its province the outer structure of the globe itself; and the changes, organic as well as merely material, succeeding one another for ages on that surface which is now the dwelling place of man. Such seeming omission we may explain by reference to a previous article in this Number, in which the present aspect of geological science, and the questions it involves, have been considered at some length. We may remark further that Geology has (within the last thirty years more especially) undergone a change which raises it far above the mere history of the location or dislocation of strata, and connects it inseparably with other branches of science still more fruitful of discovery. Fossil Geology, the creation of our own time, is allied in every part with the history and physiology of animal and vegetable life;—that great domain of knowledge which, though closely encircled round by physical laws and phenomena, and approached only through these, has still a secret region within, the law and principle of life, hitherto inaccessible by any method of human inquiry. It was our original design to have included this latter subject in the present article; as illustrating, not less than other branches of science, the advances made in actual knowledge, and the spirit which impels and animates to further research. While admitting that this spirit has sometimes run riot upon questions the very mystery of which invites and emboldens speculation, we find true inductive science moving steadily onwards, amidst these more erratic courses, to those truths—the *κρήμα ἐς ἡμέραν*—which are the certain reward of all legitimate inquiry. So much, however, has recently been attained in animal and vegetable physiology, that not even the briefest summary could bring it within our present limits; and we must postpone till some future occa-

sion, if such should occur, our notice of these eminent discoveries, and of the works which best describe and illustrate them. What we have just drawn from other branches of physical science will, we trust, adequately fulfil our intention of showing in what spirit such science has been recently pursued; and with what signal success in compassing and expounding the great phenomena of the natural world.

ART. IV.—*Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin: comprising the celebrated Political and Satirical Poems, Parodies, and Jeux-d'esprit of the Right Hon. George Canning, the Earl of Carlisle, Marquis Wellesley, the Right Hon. J. H. Frere, W. Gifford, Esq., the Right Hon. W. Pitt, G. Ellis, Esq., and others. With Explanatory Notes, by CHARLES EDMONDS. Second edition, considerably enlarged. With Six Etchings by the famous caricaturist JAMES GILLRAY. London: 1854.*

AT the risk of startling many of our readers, we avow our conviction that the Right Hon. George Canning has never been fairly judged or duly appreciated by his countrymen. In Europe and America, he symbolises a policy; in England, he is little better than a name. 'There died the last of the rhetoricians,' was the exclamation of a great northern critic and man of genius. Yet the brilliant effusions, the 'purple patches,' of this so-called rhetorician were underlaid and elevated by more thought and argument than would suffice to set up a host of the 'practical men,' who complacently repeat and dwell upon the sneer. His sacrifices in the cause of religious liberty were great and palpable. For that cause, as he truly said, he had surrendered power at a period (1812) when he would readily have bartered ten years of life for two of office. Side by side with Huskisson, of whose views he was the most eloquent exponent, he was (after Pitt) the first eminent Tory who embraced the doctrines of Free Trade. Yet Peel, who twice over resisted the progress of enlightened opinion till he could resist no longer without dismembering the empire or risking a war of classes, is imperishably enshrined in men's minds and memories as the statesman to whose welcome although tardy abandonment of long cherished errors the nation stands indebted for Catholic Emancipation and cheap bread.

Canning's death, indeed, was in every sense of the word unfamely. It took place at the period most unfavourable for his fame; for the intermediate ground he had hitherto occupied between the two great parties, somewhat analogous to that of

the amphibious race of Liberal-Conservatives in our own time, had inevitably prevented him from enjoying the sympathy or cordial support of either. Nay, it had occasionally exposed him to the enmity or suspicion of both, and he needed a year or two of power to inaugurate a well-defined policy, and form a strong party of his own. Nature had intended Canning for a Whig. His opinions were enlightened; his sympathies were liberal; and if he had been born ten years later, we entertain no doubt that he would have cast in his lot with that great party of Reform, which has laboured with so much success, first in opposition, and afterwards in power, to regenerate the institutions and to expand the policy of England. But Mr. Canning entered public life at the moment when a fierce Tory reaction, excited by the monstrous excesses of the French Revolution, had confounded Liberalism with Jacobinism, and when Mr. Pitt himself sacrificed to repression and to war the more enlarged views with which he had entered on the administration of public affairs. Bred in this school, Canning's impetuous disposition flung him into the tide of party at its flood. His wit and his eloquence were devoted to a cause which was not that of mankind; and he was habitually engaged in warfare with those whose policy and whose labours he might, in more favourable times, have applauded and shared. Towards the close of his career these liberal tendencies, which belonged to his generous nature, forced their way through the restraints of party; and the Tories, faithful to their practice of hunting down the men of genius whom accident or tradition may have placed at their head, became his bitterest enemies and harried him to the grave. The consequence was that in the prime of his life and the heyday of his fame, the greatness of his talents was not recognised by the Whigs, and that the brilliant part he played from 1820 to 1827 was maligned by the Tories. Our own honoured ally, Sydney Smith — *homo impar congressus* — was the most formidable and persevering of his assailants. Mr. Canning and his parasites were the subjects of the matchless comparison of the blue-bottle fly — 'the bluest, grandest, merriest, most important animal in existence'; and throughout the whole of his celebrated letters, Peter Plymley persisted in treating Canning as a mere 'joker of jokes,' and thus summed up his merits and demerits in the year 1808: —

'I can only say I have listened to him long and often, with the greatest attention; I have used every exertion in my power to take a fair measure of him, and it appears to me impossible to hear him upon any arduous topic without perceiving that he is eminently deficient in those solid and serious qualities, upon which, and upon

which alone, the confidence of a great country can properly repose. He sweats, and labours, and works for sense, and Mr. Ellis always seems to think it is coming, but it does not come: the machine can't draw up what is not to be found in the spring: Providence has made him a light-jesting paragraph-writing man, and that he will remain to his dying day.

'When he is jocular, he is strong; when he is serious, he is like Samson in a wig: any ordinary person is a match for him; a song, an ironical letter, a burlesque ode, an attack in the newspaper upon Nicholl's eyes, a smart speech of twenty minutes, full of gross misrepresentations and clever turns, excellent language, a spirited manner, lucky quotation, success in provoking dull men, some half information picked up in Pall Mall in the morning—these are your friend's natural weapons; all these things he can do; here I allow him to be truly great; nay, I will be just, and go still farther—if he would confine himself to these things, and consider the facile and the playful to be the basis of his character, he would, for that species of man, be universally allowed to be a person of a very good understanding: call him a legislator, a reasoner, and the conductor of the affairs of a great nation, and it seems to me as absurd as if a butterfly were to teach bees to make honey. That he is an extraordinary writer of small poetry, and a diner out of the highest order, I do most readily admit. After George Selwyn, and perhaps Tickell, there has been no such man for this half century.'

But in this passage our incomparable friend was unconsciously giving point and currency to the very objections often urged against himself, and which always are urged against every wit or man of genius who has the misfortune to startle dulness from its self-complacency. How long did it not take, in his own case, to compel the universal admission that his own exquisite humour was the finest product of sense and reason,—the steel point of the feathered shaft that went swift and unerring to the mark? At the same time, we must make ample allowance for the asperity which was conventionally permitted to combatants, with tongue or pen, fifty years since. Let it also be remembered that, if Sydney Smith did not spare Canning or his 'parasites,' Canning had not spared some of Sydney Smith's dearest and most esteemed friends; and, in reviving the memory of their swashing blows at the distance of half a century, we feel the same admiration for the wit and wisdom displayed on either side, irrespective of personal and party motives, as we do in reverting to Dryden's portrait of Achitophel or Pope's sketch of Sporus. In a retrospective view of satirical literature which throws a vivid light on political and social history, it matters little whether any given specimen of irony or invective was aimed by a Whig at a Tory or by a Tory at a Whig.

The world is a jealous world, and reluctantly accords the palm in more than one line of superiority or walk of excellence to the same competitor. If Canning had not shone in light literature, or 'small poetry,' his claim to rank as an orator of the first class would have been conceded long prior to 1808. If his other titles to fame had not subsequently merged and been forgotten in his career as a statesman, we should not now be under the necessity of asserting his independent and distinct right to rank as a man of letters; for could all his contributions to light literature be collected, he would be admitted to fall short of few political satirists of the more fugitive order in grace, point, or felicity; and to equal the best of them in fecundity and variety. And this we say with especial reference to Swift: Sir Charles Hanbury Williams: the author of 'Anticipation' (Tickell), and the other principal contributors to the 'Rolliad': Peter Pindar, Gifford, Theodore Hook, and Thomas Moore, who, we think, is more indisputably the first in this order of composition than in any other which he touched and adorned.

The importance not long since attached to Latin prosody and the artistical combination of longs and shorts, was hardly exaggerated in the witty remark, that a false quantity in a man was pretty nearly tantamount to a *faux pas* in a woman. The Marquis of Wellesley would appear, from his private correspondence, to have been prouder of his Latin verses than of his Indian policy; and the late Lord Tenterden devoted more of his long vacation to the polishing of his odes in the language and manner of Horace, than to the consolidation of statutes or preparation of judgments. In their younger days, which were also Canning's, graceful scholarship was a high social and literary distinction in itself. But notwithstanding the brilliant example set by Sir George Lewis and Mr. Gladstone, the class within which the taste and the capacity for these pursuits are still cultivated has gradually become more select than numerous, and the fame of any modern statesman would be deemed equivocal if it required to be supported or enhanced by a school exercise or a prize poem. We therefore lay no stress on Canning's contributions to the 'Musæ Etonenses;' but we pause at the 'Microcosm,' which, though the production of boyhood, contains many passages which would reflect no discredit on the most accomplished mind in its maturity.

The formal title of the collected papers runs thus, 'The Microcosm, a Periodical Work, by Gregory Griffin, of the College of Eton. Inscribed to the Rev. Dr. Davies. In two

'volumes.' It consists of a series of papers after the manner of the 'Spectator,' published weekly (on the Monday), from Nov. 6. 1786, to July 30. 1787, both inclusive. The concluding number contains the will of the editor, Mr. Gregory Griffin, by which he bequeaths 'the whole of the aforesaid essays, poems, letters, &c. &c. to my much-beloved friends, J. Smith, G. Canning, R. Smith, and J. Frere, to be among them divided as shall be hereafter by me appointed, except such legacies as shall be hereafter by me assigned to other my worthy and approved friends.' Amongst the special bequests we find: 'Item. To Mr. George Canning, now of the College of Eton, I do give and bequeath all my papers, essays, &c. &c., signed with B.' The best of these are No. 2, on Swearing; Nos. 11 & 12, Critique on the Heroic Poem of the Knave of Hearts; and No. 30, on Mr. Newbery's Little Books, including a parallel between the character of Tom Thumb and that of Ulysses. Each of these is remarkable for an easy and abundant flow of humour, with (to borrow one of Dr. Johnson's expressions) a bottom of good sense. The subject of Swearing was judiciously chosen; and its importance is heightened with a comic seriousness which would have provoked an approving smile from the Short-faced Gentleman, obviously proposed as a model by the youthful essayist. For example—

'It is an old proverbial expression, that "there go two words to a bargain;" now I should not a little admire the ingenuity of that calculator who could define, to any tolerable degree of exactness, how many oaths go to one in these days: for I am confident that there is no business carried on, from the wealthiest bargains of the Exchange, to the sixpenny chafferings of a St. Giles's huckster, in which swearing has not a considerable share. And almost every tradesman, "meek and much a liar," will, if his veracity be called in question, coolly consign to Satan some portion of himself, payable on demand, in case his goods be not found answerable to his description of their quality.

'Nay, even the female sex have, to their no small credit, caught the happy contagion; and there is scarce a mercer's wife in the kingdom but has her innocent unmeaning imprecations, her little oaths "softened into nonsense," and, with squeaking treble, mincing blasphemy into odsbodikins, slitterkins, and such like, will "swear you like a sucking dove, ay, an it were any nightingale."

It was Swift, we believe, who, happening to be present when a party of accomplished friends were eagerly talking over a game at cards, completed and presented them with an estimate of the proportion which their oaths bore to the rational or intelligible portion of their discourse. Hotspur tells his wife that she swears like a confit-maker's wife; and

Bob Acre's theory of sentimental swearing must have been freshly remembered in 1787. Yet there is both novelty and ingenuity in Canning's mode of enforcing the same argument; and the recollection of Addison's commentary on 'Chevy Chase' rather enhances the pleasure with which we read his youthful imitator's critical analysis of what he designates the epic poem beginning—

‘The queen of hearts
She made some tarts
All on a summer's day.’

If self-love did not blind the best of us to our own errors and absurdities, almost every modern editor or commentator who has aspired to emulate the conjectural, and often happy, audacity of Warburton, might fancy that the quiet irony of the following paragraph was levelled at himself:—

“All on a summer's day.”

‘I cannot leave this line without remarking, that one of the Scribleri, a descendant of the famous Martinus, has expressed his suspicions of the text being corrupted here, and proposes, instead of “All on,” reading “Alone,” alleging, in the favour of this alteration, the effect of solitude in raising the passions. But Hiccius Doctius, a high Dutch commentator, one nevertheless well versed in British literature, in a note of his usual length and learning, has confuted the arguments of Scriblerus. In support of the present reading, he quotes a passage from a poem written about the same period with our author's, by the celebrated Johannes Pastor, (most commonly known as Jack Shepherd,) entitled “An Elegiac Epistle to the Turnkey of Newgate,” wherein the gentleman declares, that rather indeed in compliance with an old custom, than to gratify any particular wish of his own, he is going

“————— All hanged for to be
Upon that fatal Tyburn tree.”

‘Now, as nothing throws greater light on an author than the concurrence of a contemporary writer, I am inclined to be of Hiccius's opinion, and to consider the “All” as an elegant expletive, or as he more aptly phrases it, “elegans expletivum.”’

There are several other papers, from which, space permitting, we should be glad to quote; and although Canning's are the gems of the publication, it may be cited as a whole to show how rapidly the tone, or what some may call the cant, of the professional essayist or critic may be caught, and how effectively it may be employed by the youngest tyro in the art. It is hardly conceivable that lads of sixteen or seventeen can have thought out for themselves, or fully appreciated, the conclusions they lay down or the canons they apply; yet there is

little in their writings by which they could be distinguished from their elders of the same average rate of talent, except what is to their advantage, namely, their superior freshness and vivacity. Just so, it is a remarkable fact, that the best of our comedies, commonly supposed to show the nicest insight into life and manners, have been produced by their respective authors at an age when they must have taken most of their applauded knowledge of society upon trust. We hear much of the intuitive powers of genius; and it certainly does sometimes arrive at surprising results by intellectual processes which seem to dispense with experience. But examination and analysis may possibly suggest a simpler solution, by demonstrating that the knowledge in question really amounts to little more than cleverness in tracing character and conduct to motives and springs of action which do least credit to mankind. 'What knowledge of life!' exclaim pit and boxes, when Mrs. Candour and Sir Benjamin Backbite are turning their intimate acquaintance into ridicule, or when Mirabell tells Millamant that 'a man may as soon make a friend by his wit, or a fortune by his honesty, as win a woman with plain dealing and sincerity.' Yet a diligent perusal of works like 'Roche-foucauld's Maxims,' or 'Grammont's Memoirs,' may supply ample materials for the creation of these fine gentlemen, coquettes, and scandal-mongers, whose conventional and heartless cynicism derives its essential piquancy from the expression and the form.

'Broad is the road nor difficult to find,
Which to the house of Satire leads mankind,
Narrow and unfrequented are the ways,
Scarce found out in an age, which lead to Praise.'

We can hardly say of Canning's satire what was said of Sheridan's, that—

'His wit in the combat, as gentle as bright,
Never carried a heart-stain away 'on its blade.'

But its severity was redeemed by its buoyancy and geniality, whilst the subjects against which it was principally aimed gave it a healthy tone and a sound foundation. Its happiest effusions will be found in the 'Anti-Jacobin,' which was set on foot to refute and ridicule the democratic rulers of revolutionary France and their admirers or apologists in England, who, it must be owned, were occasionally hurried into a culpable degree of extravagance and laxity by their enthusiasm. The first number of this celebrated publication appeared on November 7. 1797; the thirty-sixth and last on July 9. 1798. The collected

numbers in prose and verse form two volumes octavo. The poetry was reprinted in a separate volume in 1799; and this volume has since been edited, with explanatory notes, by Mr. Charles Edmonds, who brought acuteness, discrimination, an appreciating spirit, and the most exemplary diligence to the performance of his task. He has taken extraordinary pains to ascertain the authorship, whether joint or several, of the contributions, yet he has evidently not been able to satisfy himself, and he certainly has not satisfied us, on this most important and interesting point. The chief difficulty arises from the discrepancy between the oral and traditional, the internal and the written, evidence. Opposite to the title of each contribution in the table of contents, Mr. Edmonds has placed the name or names of the supposed writer or writers. The authorities on which he relies are four: — ‘Canning’s own copy of the poetry; Lord Burghersh’s copy; Wright the publisher’s copy; information of W. Upcott, amanuensis.’ The following curious account, printed between inverted commas, is subjoined to the table of contents: —

‘Wright, the publisher of the “Anti-Jacobin,” lived at 169, Piccadilly, and his shop was the general morning resort of the friends of the ministry, as Debrett’s was, of the oppositionists. About the time when the “Anti-Jacobin” was contemplated, Owen, who had been the publisher of Burke’s pamphlets, failed. The editors of the “Anti-Jacobin” took his house, paying the rent, taxes, &c., and gave it up to Wright, reserving to themselves the first floor, to which a communication was opened through Wright’s house. Being thus enabled to pass to their own rooms through Wright’s shop, where their frequent visits did not excite any remarks, they contrived to escape particular observation.

‘Their meetings were most regular on Sundays, but they not unfrequently met on other days of the week, and in their rooms were chiefly written the poetical portions of the work. What was written was generally left open upon the table, and as others of the party dropped in, hints or suggestions were made; sometimes whole passages were contributed by some of the parties present, and afterwards altered by others, so that it is almost impossible to ascertain the names of the authors.

‘GIFFORD was the working editor, and wrote most of the refutations and corrections of the “Lies,” “Mistakes,” and “Misrepresentations.” The papers on finance were chiefly by PRRY: the first column was frequently for what he might send; but his contributions were uncertain, and generally very late, so that the space reserved for him was sometimes filled up by other matter. He only once met the editors at Wright’s. UPCOTT, who was at the time assistant in Wright’s shop, was employed as amanuensis, to copy out for the printer the various contributions, that the authors’ handwriting might not be detected.’

The editor, speaking in his own proper person, continues : —

‘For the above interesting particulars, as well as for most of the names of the authors, the public are indebted to the researches of E. Hawkins, Esq., of the British Museum.

‘It is probable, notwithstanding Lord Burghersh’s assertion, that Mr. Hammond did not write one line, certainly not of verse. With regard to Mr. Wright’s appropriation of particular passages to different authors, it is obviously mere conjecture. Both Canning and Gifford professed *not* to be able to make such distribution; but the former’s share of ‘New Morality’ was so very much the largest as to entitle him to be considered its author.’

We learn from Mr. Edmonds that almost all his authorities practically resolve themselves into one, the late Mr. Upcott, and that he never saw either of the alleged copies on which his informant relied. As regards the principal one, Canning’s own, after the fullest inquiries amongst his surviving relatives and friends (with the exception of the Governor-General of India) we cannot discover a trace of its existence at any period. Lord Burghersh (the present Earl of Westmoreland) was under fourteen years of age during the publication of the ‘Anti-Jacobin;’ and we very much doubt whether either the publisher or the amanuensis (be he who he may), was admitted to the complete confidence of the contributors, or whether either the prose or poetry was composed as stated. In a letter to the late Madame de Girardin, *apropos* of her play, ‘L’Ecole des Journalistes,’ Jules Janin happily exposes the assumption that good leading articles ever were, or ever could be, produced over punch and broiled bones, amidst intoxication and revelry. Equally untenable is the belief that poetical pieces, like the best of the ‘Anti-Jacobin,’ were written in the common rooms of the confraternity, open to constant intrusion, and left upon the table to be corrected or completed by the first comer. The unity of design discernible in each, the glowing harmony of the thoughts and images, and the exquisite finish of the versification, tell of silent and solitary hours spent in brooding over, maturing, and polishing a cherished conception; and young authors, still unknown to fame, are least of all likely to sink their individuality in this fashion. We know, as a matter of fact, that their confidential meetings, to compare notes and talk over suggestions, were really held at Lady Malmesbury’s, in Park Place; and we suspect that their main object in going to Wright’s was to correct their proofs and see one another’s articles in their more finished state. Their meetings, if for anything, would be most regular on Sundays, because the

they aided one another may be collected from a well authenticated anecdote. When Frere had completed the first part of the 'Loves of the Triangles,' he exultingly read over the following lines to Canning, and defied him to improve upon them:—

'Lo! where the chimney's sooty tube ascends,
The fair TROCHAI from the corner bends!
Her coal-black eyes upturned, incessant mark
The eddying smoke, quick flame, and volant spark;
Mark with quick ken, where flashing in between,
Her much-loved *Smoke-Jack* glimmers thro' the scene;
Mark, how his various parts together tend,
Point to one purpose,—in one object end;
The spiral grooves in smooth meanders flow,
Drags the long chain, the polished axles glow,
While slowly circumploes the piece of beef below:'

Canning took the pen and added—

'The conscious fire with bickering radiance burns,
Eyes the rich joint, and roasts it as it turns.'

These two lines are now blended with the original text, and constitute, we are informed on the best authority, the only flaw in Frere's title to the sole authorship of the First Part. The Second and Third Parts were by Canning.

By the kindness of Lord Hatherton, we have now before us a bound volume containing all the Numbers of 'The Anti-Jacobin' as they originally appeared,—eight pages quarto, with double columns, price sixpence. On the fly-leaf is inscribed: 'This copy belonged to the Marquess Wellesley, and was purchased at the sale of his library after his death, January, 1842. H.' On the cover is pasted an engraved label of the arms and name of a former proprietor, Charles William Flint, with the pencilled addition of 'Confidential Amanuensis.' In this copy, Canning's name is subscribed to (amongst others) the following pieces, which are also assigned to him (along with a large share in the most popular of the rest) by the most trustworthy rumours and traditions:—'Inscription for the Door of the Cell in Newgate where Mrs. Brownrigg, the Prenticide, was confined previous to her execution;' 'The Friend of Humanity and the Knife-Grinder;' the Lines addressed 'To the Author of the Epistle to the Editors of the Anti-Jacobin;' 'The Progress of Man' (all three parts); and 'New Morality.'

With the single exception of 'The Friend of Humanity and the Knife-Grinder,' no piece in the collection is more freshly remembered than the 'Inscription for the Cell of Mrs. Brownrigg,' who

'Whipp'd two female prentices to death,
And hid them in the coal-hole.'

The answer to 'The Author of the Epistle to the Editors of 'the Anti-Jacobin' is less known, and it derives a fresh interest from the fact, recently made public, that the Epistle (which appeared in the 'Morning Chronicle' of Jan. 17. 1798) was the composition of William Lord Melbourne. The beginning shows that the veil of incognito had been already penetrated.

'Whoe'er ye are, all hail!—whether the skill
Of youthful CANNING guides the ranc'rous quill;
With powers mechanic far above his age,
Adapts the paragraph and fills the page;
Measures the column, mends whate'er's amiss,
Rejects THAT letter, and accepts of THIS;
Or HAMMOND, leaving his official toil,
O'er this great work consume the midnight oil—
Bills, passports, letters, for the Muses quit,
And change dull business for amusing wit.'

After referring to 'the poetic sage, who sung of Gallia in a 'headlong rage,' the epistle proceeds:—

'I swear by all the youths that MALMESBURY chose,*
By ELLIS' sapient prominence of nose,
By MORFETH's gait, important, proud, and big—
By Leveson Gower's crop-imitating wig,
That, could the pow'rs which in those numbers shine,
Could that warm spirit animate my line,
Your glorious deeds which humbly I rehearse—
Your deeds should live immortal as my verse;
And, while they wonder'd whence I caught my flame,
Your sons should blush to read their fathers' shame.'

Happily the eminent and accomplished sons of these fathers will smile, rather than blush, at this allusion to their sires, and smile the more when they remember from which side the attack proceeded.

It is clear from the answer, that whilst the band were not a little ruffled by this attack, they had not the remotest suspicion that their assailant was a youth in his nineteenth year. Amongst other prefatory remarks they say:—

'We assure the author of the epistle, that the answer which we have here the honour to address to him, contains our genuine and undisguised sentiments upon the merits of the poem.

'Our conjectures respecting the authors and abettors of this per-

* It will be remembered that these eminent persons were chosen by Lord Malmesbury to accompany him on his mission to Lille, and associated with him in the abortive negotiations for peace.

formance may possibly be as vague and unfounded as theirs are with regard to the EDITORS of the "Anti-Jacobin." We are sorry that we cannot satisfy their curiosity upon this subject—but we have little anxiety for the gratification of our own.

'It is only necessary to add, what is most conscientiously the truth, that this production, such as it is, is *by far the best* of all the attacks that the combined wits of the cause have been able to muster against the "Anti-Jacobin."

The answer opens thus:—

'BARD of the borrow'd lyre! to whom belong
The shreds and remnants of each hackney'd song;
Whose verse thy friends in vain for wit explore,
And count but *one good line* in eighty-four!
Whoe'er thou art, all hail! Thy bitter smile
Gilds our dull page, and cheers our humble toil!'

The 'one good line' was 'by Leveson Gower's crop-imitating wig,' but the Epistle contains many equally good and some better. The speculations as to its authorship must have afforded no slight amusement to the writer and his friends.

The 'Progress of Man' is a parody on 'The Progress of Civil Society,' a didactic poem, in six books, by Mr. Payne Knight, published in 1796. It was strongly imbued with the new philosophy, and awarded a decided superiority to the unsophisticated ways of man in his savage or natural state over the customs and manners (tacitly assumed to be unnatural) of civilisation. Like most of the productions mentioned in the 'Dunciad,' it is now only redeemed from utter oblivion by the poignant ridicule which it provoked. Mr. Knight's poetical description of the universality of the sexual passion, which he described as 'warming the whale on Zembla's frozen shore,' is rather imitated and amplified, than exaggerated, in the lines

'How Lybian tigers' chawdrons love assails,
And warms, midst seas of ice, the melting whales;—
Cools the crimplt cod, fierce pangs to perch imparts,
Shrinks shrivell'd shrimps, but opens oysters' hearts;
Then say, how all these things together tend
To one great truth, prime object, and good end?'

Equally good are the lines in which the placidity of the animal and vegetable races is contrasted (as it actually was by Mr. Payne Knight) with the restlessness of mankind:—

'First—to each living thing, whate'er its kind,
Some lot, some part, some station is assign'd.
The feather'd race with pinions skim the air—
Not so the mackerel, and still less the bear;

This roams the *wood*, carniv'rous for his prey !
That with soft roe pursues his watery way :
This slain by hunters, yields his shaggy hide ;
That, caught by fishers, is on Sundays cried.—
 But each contented with his humble sphere,
 Moves unambitious through the circling year.'

Part the second is, short, and contains little worth quoting, except the lines in which the gradual growth of the carnivorous tendency in the human species is traced and accounted for. The savage sees a tiger devouring a leveret or a pig, and is forthwith smitten with the desire to do likewise. He first, guided by instinct, constructs a bow and arrow.

'Then forth he fares. Around in careless play,
 Kids, pigs, and lambkins unsuspecting stray ;
 With grim delight he views the sportive band,
 Intent on blood, and lifts his murderous hand.
 Twangs the bent bow—resounds the fateful dart,
 Swift-wing'd, and trembles in a porker's heart.'

The concluding part is devoted to Marriage, which Mr. Payne Knight has treated in the manner of Eloisa's famous epistle to Abelard. After an invocation to the South Sea Islands, and a glowing sketch of the happy absence of form with which connubial rites are there celebrated, the parody proceeds :—

'Learn hence, each nymph, whose free aspiring mind
 Europe's cold laws, and colder customs bind—
 Oh ! learn, what Nature's genial laws decree—
 What Otahcite is, let Britain be !

'Of WHIST or CRIBBAGE mark th' amusing game—
 The partners *changing*, but the SPORT the *same*.
 Else would the gamester's anxious ardour cool,
 Dull every deal, and stagnant every pool.—
 — Yet must *one* Man, with one unceasing Wife,
 Play the LONG-RUBBER of connubial life.'

Then comes the inimitable portrait of Adelaide, in 'The Stranger :—

'With look sedate, and staid beyond her years,
 In matron weeds a Housekeeper appears.
 The jingling keys her comely girdle deck—
 Her 'kerchief colour'd, and her apron *check*.
 Can that be Adelaide, that "soul of whim,"
 Reform'd in practice, and in manner prim ?
 — On household cares intent, with many a sigh
 She turns the pancake, and she moulds the pie ;

Melts into sauces rich the savoury ham ;
 From the crush'd berry strains the lucid jam ;
 Bids brandied cherries, by infusion slow,
 Imbibe new flavour, and their own forego,
 Sole cordial of her heart, sole solace of her woe !
 While still, responsive to each mournful moan,
 The saucepan simmers in a softer tone.'

In taking up Frere's conception of 'The Loves of the Triangles,' Canning might have been encouraged by the example of Addison, who borrowed, or wrested, Sir Roger de Coverley from Steele. The second part of this poem is principally remarkable for the airy grace and fineness of touch with which the abstract is invested with the qualities of the concrete and sentient. The object of affection to the rival curves, who display their feelings in the lines we are about to quote, is 'The Phœnician Cone,' thus mentioned in a note:—

'*Phœnician Cone*.—It was under this shape that Venus was worshipped in Phœnicia. MR. HIGGINS thinks it was the *Venus Urania*, or Celestial Venus; in allusion to which, the Phœnician grocers first introduced the practice of preserving sugar-loaves in blue or sky-coloured paper—he also believes that the *conical* form of the original grenadier's cap was typical of the loves of Mars and Venus.'

This is the shape, being, or entity, whose favours are emulously sought by Parabola, Hyperbola, and Ellipsis; like the three goddesses contending for the apple, and with equal freedom from prudery:—

'And first, the fair PARABOLA behold,
 Her timid arms, with virgin blush, unfold !
 Though, on one *focus* fixed, her eyes betray
 A heart that glows with love's resistless sway ;
 Though, climbing oft, she strives with bolder grace
 Round his tall neck to clasp her fond embrace,
 Still ere she reach it, from his polished side
 Her trembling hands in devious *Tangents* glide.
 'Not thus HYPERBOLA : with subtlest art
 The blue-eyed wanton plays her changeful part ;
 Quick as her *conjugated axes* move
 Through every posture of luxurious love,
 Her sportive limbs with easiest grace expand ;
 Her charms unveiled provoke the lover's hand :
 Unveiled, except in many a filmy ray,
 Where light *Asymptotes* o'er her bosom play,
 Nor touch her glowing skin, nor intercept the day.
 'Yet why, ELLIPSIS, at thy fate repine ?
 More lasting bliss, securer joys are thine.

Though to each fair his treacherous wish may stray,
 Though each, in turn, may seize a transient sway.
 'Tis thine with mild coercion to restrain,
 Twine round his struggling heart, and bind with endless chain.'

Thus, continues the poem, three directors woo the young republic's virgin charms: thus three sister witches hailed Macbeth: thus three Fates weave the woof: thus three Graces attire Venus: thus three daughters form the happiness or misery of Lear: and, lastly,

'So down thy hill, romantic Ashbourn, glides
 The Derby dilly, carrying *Three INSIDES*.'

When the late Mr. O'Connell applied these celebrated lines to the present Earl of Derby, he made the dilly carry six insides, which had the double advantage of describing the vehicle more accurately, and of giving additional point to the joke.

The 'Rolliad,' it will be remembered, consists of extracts from a supposed poem, interspersed with notes and commentaries. This plan is imitated in the third and last part of 'The Loves of the Triangles,' which does not profess to be more than the concluding lines of a canto, describing 'The Loves of the Giant Isosceles, and the picture of the Asses-Bridge and its several illustrations.' London Bridge is one of these illustrations, and the Bridge of Lodi another.

'So, towering Alp! from thy majestic ridge*
 Young Freedom gazed on Lodi's blood-stained Bridge;
 Saw in thick throngs, conflicting armies rush,
 Ranks close on ranks, and squadrons squadrons crush;
 Burst in bright radiance through the battle's storm,
 Waved her broad hands, displayed her awful form;
 Bade at her feet regenerate nations bow,
 And twined the wreath round BUONAPARTE's brow.'

* *Alp, or Alps.*—A ridge of mountains which separate the North of Italy from the South of Germany. They are evidently primeval and volcanic, consisting of granite, toadstone, and basalt, and several other substances, containing animal and vegetable remains, and affording numberless undoubted proofs of the infinite antiquity of the earth, and of the consequent falsehood of the Mosaic chronology.

It will be collected from this note that the momentous question involved in the case of Moses against Murchison, was raised long before the ingenious founder of the Silurian system began to disturb or affright the more narrow-minded portion of the clerical body. We fancy, moreover, that in young Freedom

gazing from the majestic ridge, we discern the outline of one of the finest apostrophes in 'Childe Harold:'

'Lo, where the Giant on the mountain stands.'

But, to give everybody his due, it should be added that two lines in the foregoing extract are suggested by—

'As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swell from the vale, and midway leaves the storm.'

The same, the finest, passage of 'The Deserted Village' appears to have haunted Canning from his youth upwards. The concluding lines of his juvenile poem entitled 'The Slavery of Greece' are a weak paraphrase of it:—

'So some tall rock whose bare, broad bosom high
Tow'rs from the earth, and braves th' inclement sky;
On whose vast top the black'ning deluge pours,
At whose wide base the thund'ring ocean roars,
In conscious pride its huge gigantic form
Surveys imperious and defies the storm.'

This is one of the strongest instances of unconscious plagiarism—for it must have been unconscious—that we remember.

In the parody, 'the imps of murder' are busily employed in building ships for the invasion of England, whilst to another troop is assigned an equally congenial and appropriate duty:—

'Ye Sylphs of DEATH! on demon pinions flit
Where the tall Guillotine is raised for PITT:
To the poised plank tie fast the monster's back,
Close the nice slider, ope the expectant sack;
Then twitch, with fairy hands, the frolic pin—
Down falls the impatient axe with deafening din;
The liberated head rolls off below,
And simpering Freedom hails the happy blow!'

Lord Jeffrey, as we are reminded by Mr. Edmonds, terms 'The Loves of the Triangles,' the perfection of parody. 'All the peculiarities,' he remarks, 'of the original poet are here brought together and crowded into a little space, where they can be compared and estimated with ease.'

Darwin thus addresses the gnomes:—

'Gnomes, as you now dissect, with hammers fine,
The granite rock, the noduled flint calcine;
Grind with strong arm the circling Chertz betwixt,
Your pure Ka—o—lins and Pe—tunt—ses mixt.'

The authors have certainly placed in broad relief the essential error of Dr. Darwin's poetic theory, his mania for personification, his wearisome and laughter-moving trick of investing with the

qualities of sentient beings the entire vegetable creation, as well as every abstract notion, and almost every noun-substantive that crossed his mind. The tendency of the political and social doctrines with which he seasoned his verse, is also justly and pointedly exposed. But, considered merely as a parody, Canning's part is open to the objection that it occasionally strikes too high a key, and awakens finer and more elevated associations than were, or could have been, evoked by the original. The cherub crew who 'their mimic task pursue,' in 'The Loves of the Triangles,' bear a much closer resemblance to the sylphs who kept watch and ward around Belinda's toilette table, than to the gnomes at work on 'nodded flint.' They recall the 'Rape of the Lock,' rather than the 'Loves of the Plants;' and we cannot accept as a perfect caricature of Dr. Darwin a production, which, in so short a space, anticipates Byron, paraphrases Goldsmith, and employs, without tarnishing, the delicate machinery of Pope.

'New Morality' is commonly regarded as the masterpiece of the 'Anti-Jacobin'; and, with the exception of a few lines, the whole of it is by Canning.

It appeared in the last Number, and he is said to have concentrated all his energies for a parting blow. The reader who comes fresh from Dryden or Pope, or even Churchill, will be disappointed on finding far less variety of images, sparkling antithesis, or condensed brilliancy of expression. The author exhibits abundant humour and eloquence, but comparatively little wit; if there be any truth in Sydney Smith's doctrine 'that the feeling of wit is occasioned by those relations of ideas which excite surprise, and surprise *alone*.' We are commonly prepared for what is coming, and our admiration is excited rather by the justness of the observations, the elevation of the thoughts, and the vigour of the style, than by a startling succession of flashes of fancy. If, as we believe, the same might be said of Juvenal, and the best of his English imitators, Johnson, we leave ample scope for praise; and 'New Morality' contains passages which have been preserved to our time, and bid fair to reach posterity, by their poetry and truth. How often are the lines on Candour quoted in entire ignorance or forgetfulness of their author: —

"Much may be said on both sides." — Hark I hear
A well-known voice that murmurs in my ear, —
The voice of CANDOUR. — Hail! most solemn sage,
Thou drivelling virtue of this moral age,
CANDOUR, which softens party's headlong rage.
CANDOUR, — which spares its foes; nor e'er descends
With bigot zeal to combat for its friends.

CANDOUR, — which loves in see-saw strain to tell
 Of acting foolishly, but meaning well;
 Too nice to praise by wholesale, or to blame,
 Convinced that *all* men's motives are the same;
 And finds, with keen discriminating sight,
 BLACK's not *so* black; — nor WHITE *so* very white.

“FOX, to be sure, was vehement and wrong:
 “But then, PITT's words, you'll own, were *rather* strong.
 “Both must be blamed, both pardon'd; 'twas just so
 “With FOX and PITT full forty years ago!
 “So WALPOLE, PULTENEY; — factions in all times
 “Have had their follies, ministers their crimes.”
 ‘Give me th' avow'd, th' erect, the manly foe,
 Bold I can meet — perhaps may turn his blow;
 But of all plagues, good Heav'n, thy wrath can send,
 Save, save, oh! save me from the *Candid Friend*!’

After reading these lines, we readily make up our minds, at the author's bidding, to distrust the next person who attempts to mitigate our censure or our praise; although we may be really giving full indulgence to a prejudice, which a very small allowance of Christian charity, self-examination, or genuine unsophisticated candour, would correct. The dangerous tendency of the doctrine is immediately afterwards shown by its application: —

‘I love the bold uncompromising mind,
 Whose principles are fix'd, whose views defined:

Who owns, when Traitors feel th' avenging rod,
 Just retribution, and the hand of God;
 Who hears the groans through Olmütz' roofs that ring,
 Of him who mock'd, misled, betray'd his king —
 Hears unappall'd, though Faction's zealots preach,
 Unmoved, unsoftened by FITZPATRICK's Speech.’

So, to show defiance of canting candour, we are required to hear unmoved the groans of a pure-minded and well-intentioned, however mistaken, patriot in a foreign prison. According to M. Guizot (in his *Memoirs*), Charles X. observed after his accession to the throne, that the only two persons who had not changed since 1789 were Lafayette and himself. Early in his revolutionary career, the general was nicknamed the Grandison Cromwell. Brave, honest, consistent, but vain, weak, and credulous, he was little better than a puppet in the hands of the principal actors of the scenes in which he played so conspicuous a part. We can, therefore, understand the refusal of sympathy to such a man when he is punished by exile for having been an instrument in the hands of the enemies of social order and rational

freedom. But to exult in his imprisonment and separation from his wife, is to prove how easily party prejudice may be confounded with 'innate sense of right,' and how necessary it is for the best of us to probe our likings and dislikings to their source.

Ten lines on the British oak have been traditionally attributed to Pitt:—

'So thine own oak, by some fair streamlet's side,
Waves its broad arms, and spreads its leafy pride,
Tow'rs from the earth, and rearing to the skies
Its conscious strength, the tempest's wrath defies:
Its ample branches shield the fowls of air,
To its cool shade the panting herds repair.
The treacherous current works its noiseless way,
The fibres loosen, and the roots decay;
Prostrate the beauteous ruin lies; and all
That shared its shelter, perish in its fall.'

It seems to have been a fixed maxim with the controversialists of those days to consider all who were not with them as against them, and this satire denounces with indiscriminating severity all who, at home or abroad, on the political or literary arena, had manifested the slightest leaning towards the new philosophy, or were even in habits of friendly intercourse with its votaries. It is also rather startling, contrasted with modern amenities, to find 'Neckar's fair daughter,' who said she would give all her fame for the power of fascinating, introduced as—

'Staël, the Epicene!
Bright o'er whose flaming cheek and purple nose
The bloom of young desire utceasing glows.'

Nor, much as Talleyrand's reputation has declined of late years, and low as his political honesty stood at all times, would any thing be now thought to justify such a diatribe as—

'Where at the blood-stain'd board expert he plies,
The lame artificer of fraud and lies;
He with the mitred head and cloven heel;—
Doom'd the coarse edge of REWBELL's jests to feel;
To stand the playful buffet, and to hear
The frequent ink-stand wizzing past his ear;
While all the five Directors laugh to see
"The limping priest so deft at his new ministry."

According to a current story, Rewbell, exasperated by Talleyrand's opposition at council, flung an inkstand at his head, exclaiming: '*Vil Emigré, tu n'as pas le sens plus droit que le pied.*' In the centre of the troop who are introduced singing the praises of Lepaux, were inconsiderately placed a

group of writers, who, with equal disregard of their respective peculiarities and opinions, were subsequently lumped together as the Lake School:—

‘And ye five other wandering bards, that move
In sweet accord of harmony and love,
COLERIDGE and SOUTHEY, LLOYD, and LAMB & Co.,
Tune all your mystic harps to praise LÉFAUX!’

Talfourd, in his ‘Life of Lamb,’ justly complains of Elia’s being accused of new theories in morality, which he detested, or represented as offering homage to ‘a French charlatan of whose existence he had never heard.’ In allusion to the same passage, Southey writes to the late Mr. Charles Wynn, Aug. 15. 1798:—

‘I know not what poor Lamb has done to be croaking there. What I think the worst part of the “Anti-Jacobin” abuse is the lumping together men of such opposite principles; this was stupid. We should have all been welcoming the Director, not the Theophilanthrope. The conductors of the “Anti-Jacobin” will have much to answer for in thus inflaming the animosities of this country. They are labouring to produce the deadly hatred of Irish faction; perhaps to produce the same end.’

The drama of ‘The Rovers,’ or ‘Double Arrangement,’ was written to ridicule the German Drama, then hardly known in this country, except through the medium of bad translations of some of the least meritorious of Schiller’s, Goethe’s, and Kotzebue’s productions. The parody is now principally remembered by Rogero’s song, of which, Mr. Edmonds states, the first five stanzas were by Mr. Canning. ‘Having been accidentally seen, previously to its publication, by Mr. Pitt, he was so amused with it that he took a pen and composed the last stanza on the spot.’ To save our readers the trouble of reference, we quote it entire:—

I.

‘Whene’r with haggard eyes I view
This dungeon that I’m rotting in,
I think of those companions true
Who studied with me at the U—
—niversity of Gottingen,—
—niversity of Gottingen.

II.

‘Sweet kerchief, check’d with heavenly blue,
Which once my love sat knotting in!—
Alas! Matilda *then* was true!
At least I thought so at the U—
—niversity of Gottingen—
—niversity of Gottingen.

III.

'Barbs! Barbs! alas! how swift you flew
 Her neat post-waggon trotting in!
 Ye bore Matilda from my view;
 Forlorn I languish'd at the U—
 —niversity of Gottingen—
 —niversity of Gottingen.

IV.

'This faded form! this pallid hue!
 This blood my veins is clotting in,
 My years are many—they were few
 When first I entered at the U—
 —niversity of Gottingen—
 —niversity of Gottingen.

V.

'There first for thee my passion grew
 Sweet! sweet Matilda Pottingen!
 Thou wast the daughter of my tu—
 —tor, law professor at the U—
 —niversity of Gottingen—
 —niversity of Gottingen.

VI.

'Sun, moon, and thou vain world, adieu,
 That kings and priests are plotting in:
 Here doom'd to starve on water gru—
 —el, never shall I see the U—
 —niversity of Gottingen—
 —niversity of Gottingen.

Canning's reputed share in 'The Rovers' excited the unreasoning indignation, and provoked the exaggerated censure, of a man who has obtained a world-wide reputation by his historical researches, most especially by his alleged skill in separating the true from the fabulous, and in filling up chasms in national annals by a process near akin to that by which Cuvier inferred the entire form and structure of an extinct species from a bone. The following passage is taken from Niebuhr's 'History of the Period of the Revolution,' (published from his Lectures, in two volumes, in 1845):—

'Canning was at that time (1807) at the head of foreign affairs in England. History will not form the same judgment of him as that formed by contemporaries. He had great talents, but was not a great statesman; he was one of those persons who distinguish themselves as the squires of political heroes. He was highly accomplished in the two classical languages, but without being a learned scholar. He was especially conversant with Greek writers. He had likewise

poetical talent, but only for satire. At first he had joined the leaders of opposition against Pitt's ministry; Lord Grey, who perceived his ambition, advised him, half in joke, to join the ministers, as he would make his fortune. He did so, and was employed to write articles for the newspapers, and satirical verses, which were often directed against his former benefactors.

'Through the influence of the ministers he came into Parliament. So long as the great eloquence of former times lasted, and the great men were alive, his talent was admired; but older persons had no great pleasure in his petulant epigrammatic eloquence and his jokes, which were often in bad taste. He joined the Society of the Anti-Jacobins, which defended everything connected with existing institutions. This society published a journal, in which the most honoured names of foreign countries were attacked in the most scandalous manner. German literature was at that time little known in England, and it was associated there with the ideas of Jacobinism and revolution. Canning then published in the "Anti-Jacobin" the most shameful pasquinade which was ever written against Germany, under the title of "Matilda Pottingen." Göttingen is described in it as the sink of all infamy; professors and students as a gang of miscreants: licentiousness, incest, and atheism as the character of the German people. Such was Canning's beginning; he was at all events useful; a sort of political Cossack.' (*Geschichte des Zeitalters der Revolution*, vol. ii. p. 242.)

'Here am I,' exclaimed Raleigh, after vainly trying to get at the rights of a squabble in the courtyard of the Tower, 'employed in writing a true history of the world, when I cannot ascertain the truth of what happens under my own window.' Here is the great restorer of Roman history—who, by the way, prided himself on his knowledge of England—hurrying into the strangest misconception of contemporary events and personages, and giving vent to a series of depreciatory mis-statements without pausing to verify the assumed groundwork of his patriotic wrath. His description of 'the most shameful pasquinade,' and his ignorance of the very title, prove that he had never seen it. If he had, he would also have known that the scene is laid at Weimar, not at Göttingen; and that the satire is almost exclusively directed against a portion of the dramatic literature of his country, which all rational admirers must admit to be indefensible. The scene in 'The Rovers,' in which the rival heroines, meeting for the first time at an inn, swear eternal friendship and embrace, is positively a feeble reflection of a scene in Goethe's 'Stella;' and no anachronism can exceed that in Schiller's 'Cabal und Liebe,' when Lady Milford, after declaring herself the daughter of the Duke of Norfolk who rebelled against Queen Elizabeth, is horrified on finding that the jewels sent her by the Grand Duke have been purchased by

the sale of 7000 of his subjects to be employed in the American war.*

Amongst the prose contributions to the 'Anti-Jacobin,' there is one in which, independently of direct evidence, the peculiar humour of Canning is discernible,—the pretended report of the meeting of the Friends of Freedom at the Crown and Anchor Tavern. The plan was evidently suggested by Tickell's 'Anticipation,' in which the debate on the Address at the opening of the Session was reported beforehand with such surprising foresight, that some of the speakers, who were thus forestalled, declined to deliver their meditated orations.

At the meeting of the Friends of Freedom, Erskine, whose habitual egotism could hardly be caricatured, is made to perorate as follows:—

'MR. ERSKINE concluded by recapitulating, in a strain of agonizing and impressive eloquence, the several more prominent heads of his speech:—He had been a soldier and a sailor, and had a son at Winchester School—he had been called by special retainers, during the summer, into many different and distant parts of the country—travelling chiefly in post-chaises—he felt himself called upon to declare that his poor faculties were at the service of his country—of the free and enlightened part of it at least—he stood here as a man—he stood in the eye, indeed in the hand, of God—to whom (in the presence of the company and waiters), he solemnly appealed—he was of noble, perhaps, Royal Blood—he had a house at Hampstead—was convinced of the necessity of a thorough and radical Reform—his pamphlet had gone through thirty editions skipping alternately the odd and even numbers—he loved the Constitution, to which he would cling and grapple—and he was clothed with the infirmities of man's nature—he would apply to the present French rulers (particularly BARRAS and REUBEL) the words of the poet:

* It is surprising that the satirist's attention was not attracted to the scene in 'Stella' in which one of the heroines describes the rapid growth of her passion to its object: 'I know not if you observed that you had enchained my interest from the first moment of our first meeting. I at least soon became aware that your eyes sought mine. Ah, Fernando, then my uncle brought the music, you took your violin, and, as you played, my eyes rested upon you free from care. I studied every feature of your face; and, during an unexpected pause, you fixed your eyes upon—upon me! They met mine! How I blushed, how I looked away! You observed it, Fernando; for from that moment I felt that you looked oftener over your music-book, often played out of tune, to the disturbance of my uncle. Every false note, Fernando, went to my heart. It was the 'sweetest confusion I ever felt in my life.'

“Be to their faults a little blind;
 Be to their virtues very kind,
 Let all their ways be unconfined,
 And clap the padlock on their mind!”

And for these reasons, thanking the gentlemen who had done him the honour to drink his health, he should propose “*MERLIN, the late Minister of Justice, and Trial by Jury!*”

A long speech is given to Mackintosh, who, under the name of Macfungus, after a fervid sketch of the Temple of Freedom which he proposes to construct on the ruins of ancient establishments, proceeds with kindling animation:—

“There our infants shall be taught to lisp in tender accents the Revolutionary Hymn—there with wreaths of myrtle, and oak, and poplar, and vine, and olive, and cypress, and ivy; with violets and roses, and daffodils and dandelions in our hands, we will swear respect to childhood, and manhood, and old age, and virginity, and womanhood, and widowhood; but, above all to the Supreme Being.

“These prospects, fellow-citizens, may possibly be deferred. The Machiavelism of Governments may for the time prevail, and this unnatural and execrable contest may yet be prolonged; but the hour is not far distant; Persecution will only serve to accelerate it, and the blood of patriotism streaming from the severing axe, will call down vengeance on our oppressor in a voice of thunder. I expect the contest, and I am prepared for it. I hope I shall never shrink, nor swerve, nor start aside, wherever duty and inclination may place me. My services, my life itself, are at your disposal—whether to act or to suffer, I am yours—with HAMPDEN in the Field, or with SIDNEY on the Scaffold. My example may be more useful to you than my talents: and this head may perhaps serve your cause more effectually, if placed on a pole upon Temple Bar, than if it was occupied in organising your committees, in preparing your revolutionary explosions, and conducting your correspondence.”

The wit and fun of these imitations are undeniable; and their injustice is equally so. Erskine, with all his egotism, was and remains the greatest of English advocates. He stemmed and turned the tide which threatened to sweep away the most valued of our free institutions in 1794; and (we say with Lord Brougham) ‘before such a precious service as this, well may the lustre of statesmen and orators grow pale.’ Mackintosh was preeminently distinguished by the comprehensiveness and moderation of his views; nor could any man be less disposed by temper, habits, or pursuits towards revolutionary courses. His Lectures on ‘The Law of Nature and Nations’ were especially directed against the new morality in general, and Godwin’s ‘Political Justice’ in particular.

At a long subsequent period (1807), Canning, when attacked in Parliament for his share in the 'Anti-Jacobin,' declared that 'he felt no shame for its character or principles, nor any other sorrow for the share he had had in it, than that which the imperfection of his pieces was calculated to inspire.' Still, it is one of the inevitable inconveniences of a connexion with the press, that the best known writers should be made answerable for the errors of their associates; and the license of the 'Anti-Jacobin' gave serious and well-founded offence to many who shared its opinions and wished well to its professed object. In Wilberforce's 'Diary' for May 18. 1799, we find, 'Pitt, Canning, and Pepper Arden came in late to dinner. I attacked Canning on indecency of "Anti-Jacobin." Coleridge, in his "Biographia Literaria" complains bitterly of the calumnious accounts given by the "Anti-Jacobin" of his early life, and asks with reason, "Is it surprising that many good men remained longer than perhaps they otherwise would have done, adverse to a party which encouraged and openly rewarded the authors of such atrocious calumnies?"'

Mr. Edmonds says that Pitt got frightened, and that the publication was discontinued at the suggestion of the Prime-Minister. It is not unlikely that Canning, now a member of the House of Commons and Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, found his connexion with it embarrassing, as his hopes rose and his political prospects expanded. Indeed, it may be questioned whether a parliamentary career can ever be united with that of the daily or weekly journalist, without compromising one or both. At all events, the original 'Anti-Jacobin' closed with the number containing 'New Morality,' and Canning had nothing to do with the monthly review started under the same name.

During the Addington administration, his muse was more than ordinarily fertile, as we had recently occasion to remark in commenting on the part taken by Mr. Pitt and his friends in the transactions of that period. Besides the celebrated song of 'The Pilot that weathered the Storm,' composed for the first meeting of the Pitt Club, he poured forth squib after squib against 'The Doctor,' interspersed with an occasional hit at the indifference, real or assumed, of Pitt. The extreme eagerness displayed by Canning for the restoration of the heaven-born minister, as well as the independent tone he assumed in his remonstrances with his chief, may be learned from 'Lord Malnesbury's Memoirs.' The best of his satirical effusions against Addington appeared in a newspaper called 'The Oracle,'

which is alluded to by Lord Grenville in a letter of June 14. 1803, as showing a disposition to go over to the Government side. 'You will see that "The Oracle" *Philippizes*, and probably for the same reasons that produced that effect of old.' They are reprinted in the 'Spirit of the Public Journals' for 1803 and 1804. As this has become a scarce and not easily accessible compilation, we shall extract a portion of the less known squibs which the concurrent voices of contemporaries assign to Canning. To him undoubtedly belongs the song:—

'How blest, how firm the statesman stands,
(Him no low intrigue shall move),
Circled by faithful *kindred* bands,
And propp'd by fond *fraternal* love!

'When his speeches hobble vilely,
What "*Hear him!*" burst from Brother Hiley;
When his faltering periods lag,
Hark to the cheers of Brother Brag!

His delicate play of fancy may be traced in the concluding lines of 'Good Intentions':

'"'Twere best, no doubt, the truth to tell,
"But still, good soul, he *means so well!*"
Others, with necromantic skill,
May bend men's passions to their will,
Raise with dark spells the tardy loan,
To shake the vaunting *Consul's* throne;
In thee no magic arts surprise,
No tricks to cheat our wondering eyes;
On thee shall no suspicion fall,
Of slight of hand, or cup and ball;
E'en foes must own thy spotless fame,
Unbranded with a *conjurer's* name!
Ne'er shall thy virtuous thoughts conspire
To wrap majestic *Thames in fire!*
And if that black and nitrous grain,
Which strews the fields with thousands slain,
Slept undiscovered yet in earth—
Thou ne'er hadst caus'd the monstrous birth,
Nor aided (such thy pure intention)
That diabolical invention!
Hail then — on whom our State is leaning!
O Minister of mildest meaning!
Blest with such virtues to talk big on,
With such a head (to hang a wig on).
Head of wisdom — soul of candour —
Happy Britain's guardian gander,
To rescue from th' invading *Gaul*
Her "*commerce, credit, capital!*"

While Rome's great goose could save alone
One Capitol — of senseless stone.'

Was it possible to say more courteously of a statesman that he was no conjuror, and that he would never have set the Thames on fire, nor have discovered the invention of gunpowder, although quite-competent to rival the feathered saviours of the Capitol? The changes are rung on the Doctor with inexhaustible versatility, as in the happy parody of Douglas :

'My name's the *Doctor* : on the Berkshire hills
My father purg'd his patients — a wise man ;
Whose constant care was to increase his store,
And keep his eldest son — myself — at home.
But I had heard of politics, and long'd
To sit within the Commons' House, and get
A place : and luck gave what my sire denied.'

'Ridicule,' writes Lord Chesterfield, 'though not founded upon truth, will stick for some time, and if thrown by a skilful hand, perhaps for ever.' Nicknames are serious matters, even in a grave country like England. In the correspondence of the time, Addington is almost invariably mentioned as the Doctor; and, as we stated in a recent Number, Lord Holland quotes the old Lord Liverpool as having 'justly observed that Addington was laughed out of power and place by the *beau monde*.' Prior to the Reform Bill, what old Lord Liverpool must have meant by the *beau monde*, namely, the fine gentlemen (including the leading wits and orators) who congregated at the clubs in St. James's Street, exercised a degree of influence which may sound strange to politicians of our day. Yet a far more powerful and better sustained fire than was brought to bear on Addington, had been directed against Pitt by the wits of the 'Rolliad,' without any perceptible effect; and the inherent weakness of Addington's government from its formation, sufficiently explains its fate, quite independently of the laughter it provoked.

When (May 7. 1804) Pitt had made up his mind to resume the Premiership, Canning was one of the first to whom he communicated his intention, and had his choice of two offices, the Treasurership of the Navy and the Secretaryship of War. He chose the former, and was thereby led to take a prominent part in defending Lord Melville. Whitbread, in moving the impeachment, happened to let fall some expressions which struck Canning in so ludicrous a light, that before the oration was well ended he had completed a report in rhyme.

'I'm like Archimedes for science and skill ;
 I'm like a young prince going straight up a hill ;
 I'm like (with respect to the fair be it said) —
 I'm like a young lady just bringing to bed.
 If you ask why the first of July I remember
 More than April, or May, or June, or November ;
 'Twas on that day, my lords, with truth I assure ye,
 My sainted progenitor set up his brewery.
 On that day, in the morn, he began brewing beer ;
 On that day, too, commenc'd his connubial career ;
 On that day he renew'd and he issued his bills ;
 On that day he clear'd out all the cash from his tills.
 On that day too he died, having finish'd his summing,
 And the angels all cried here's old Whitbread a-coming.
 So that day still I hail with a smile and a sigh
 For his beer with an e, and his bier with an i.
 And still on that day in the hottest of weather,
 The whole Whitbread family dine all together.
 So long as the beams of this house shall support
 The roof which o'ershades this respectable court —
 As long as the light shall pour into these windows,
 Where Hastings was tried for oppressing the Hindoos,
 My name shall shine bright, as my ancestor's shines, —
 Mine recorded in journals, his blazon'd on signs.'

Useful as Canning's talent for satire had proved to his party, it tended rather to retard than accelerate his advancement to high office. Thus Lord Malmesbury (March 14. 1807) writes: — 'He is unquestionably very clever, very essential to Government, but he is *hardly yet a statesman*, and his dangerous habit of *quizzing* (which he cannot restrain) would be most unpopular in any department which required pliancy, tact, or conciliatory behaviour.' In the very next month after this was written, however, Canning was made Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the administration formed by the Duke of Portland. Henceforth his contributions to the press became less frequent, and at length closed altogether, except when he was tempted by some especially congenial topic. He was one of the three or four persons who were first consulted about the institution of the 'Quarterly Review,' suggested by Sir Walter Scott for the purpose of counteracting what he was pleased to call the widespread and dangerous influence of this Journal. In a letter to Mr. George Ellis, dated Nov. 2. 1808, he says: — 'Canning is, I have good reason to know, very anxious about the plan.' On the 18th he writes to the same correspondent: — 'As our start is of such immense consequence, don't you think Mr. Canning, though unquestionably our Atlas, might for a day find a Hercules on whom to devolve the burden of the

'globe, while he writes us a review? I know what an audacious request this is; but suppose he should, as great statesmen sometimes do, take a political fit of the gout, and absent himself from a large ministerial dinner, which might give it him in good earnest,—dine at three on a chicken and pint of wine, and lay the foundation of at least one good article. Let us but once get afloat, and our labour is not worth talking of; but, till then, all hands must work hard.*

The request was not made, or not granted, or no Hercules could be found to bear the burden of the globe whilst Atlas was composing an article for the 'Quarterly.' But we learn from the same authority, that two articles on Sir John Sinclair and his Bullion Treatises, which appeared in the numbers for November, 1810, and February, 1811, were the joint production of Canning and Frere; and it was understood at the time that the popularity of an article headed 'Mr. Brougham—Education Committee,' which appeared in the same review for December, 1818, was mainly owing to the additions and finishing touches of the accomplished statesman. This article was professedly by Dr. Monck, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, who merely supplied the coarse cloth on which the gold lace and spangles were to be sewn,—the pudding for the reception of the plums,—and made himself ridiculous by subsequently taking credit for the wit.†

The articles on Sir John Sinclair probably owed much of their success to the popular impression of that highly respectable and rather laughable personage. They are fair specimens of the art of 'abating and dissolving pompous gentlemen.' But the humour is spun out to tediousness; and the consequence is, that not a single passage, condensed and pointed enough for quotation, could be selected from either of them. The same remark applies to the lighter passages interspersed amongst the weighty and solid lucubrations of Dr. Monck.

* Lockhart's Life of Sir Walter Scott, vol. ii. p. 214.

† In his third letter to Archdeacon Singleton, Sydney Smith says:—'I was afraid the bishop would attribute my promotion to the Edinburgh Review; but upon the subject of promotion by reviews he preserves an impenetrable silence. If my excellent patron, Earl Grey, had any reasons of this kind, he may at least be sure that the reviews commonly attributed to me were really written by me. I should have considered myself as the lowest of created beings to have disguised myself in another man's wit and sense, and to have received a reward to which I was not entitled.' The late Mr. Croker laid claim to the credit of having aided Canning in polishing and pointing this article.

That, for example, in which the proposed Commission is quizzed in Canning's peculiar manner, occupies more than a page, but we can only find room for the concluding sentences:—

'It is even affirmed, we know not how truly, that with the help of the gentlemen of the British Museum, the learned institutor had actually constructed the statutes of his foundation, in that language of which his late researches have made him so absolute a master; and the oath to be taken by each candidate for a fellowship, and by each fellow on his admission, ran in something like the following terms: the first, *Se nunquam duo vel plura Brevia intra Biennium accepisse*; the second, of a more awful import, *Se nullas prorsus habere possessiones præterquam unam Purpuream Baggam flaccescentem omnino inanitatis causâ.*'

The last of Canning's political squibs that has fallen in our way, is the following:—

LETTER FROM A CAMBRIDGE TUTOR TO HIS FORMER PUPIL, BECOME A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT: WRITTEN IN THE YEAR (1824) IN WHICH THE RIGHT HONOURABLE FREDERICK ROBINSON, CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, REPEALED HALF THE DUTY ON SEABORNE COALS IMPORTED INTO THE PORT OF LONDON.

'Yes! fallen on times of wickedness and woe,
We have a Popish ministry, you know!
Prepared to light, I humbly do conceive,
New fires in Smithfield, with Dick Martin's leave.
Canning for this with Robinson conspires,—
The victim, this provides, — and that, the fires.
Already they, with purpose ill-concealed,
The tax on coals have partially repealed;
While Huskisson, with computation keen,
Can tell how many pecks will burn a dean.
Yes! deans shall burn! and at the funeral pyre,
With eyes averted from the unhallow'd fire —
Irreverent posture! — Harrowby shall stand,
And hold his coat flaps up, with either hand.'

It may be doubted whether any of the very clever squibs collected in 'The New Whig Guide,' are by Canning, but he has been traditionally credited with the parody of Moore's beautiful song, 'Believe me, if all those endearing young 'charms;' the gentleman addressed being a distinguished commoner, afterwards ennobled, who was far from meriting the character thereby fastened on him:—

'Believe me, if all those ridiculous airs,
Which you practise so pretty to-day,
Should vanish by age and your well-twisted hairs,
Like my own, be both scanty and grey:

'Thou would'st still be a goose, as a goose thou hast been,
 Though a fop and a fribble no more,
 And the world that has laughed at the fool of eighteen,
 Would laugh at the fool of threescore.

'Tis not whilst you wear that short coat of light brown,
 Tight breeches and neckcloth so full,
 That the absolute void of a mind can be shown,
 Which time will but render more dull.

'Oh, the fool that is truly so, never forgets,
 But as truly fools on to the close,
 As P * * * leaves the debate when he sits,
 Just as dark as it was when he rose.'

Most of the families with whom Canning lived on terms of cordial intimacy have retained one or more specimens of his occasional verses. These playful lines were addressed to Mrs. Leigh on her wedding-day, *apropos* of a present from her to him of a piece of stuff to be made into a pair of shooting breeches:—

'While all to this auspicious day,
 Well pleased their grateful homage pay,
 And sweetly smile, and softly say
 A thousand pretty speeches;
 'My muse shall touch her tuneful strings,
 Nor scorn the lay her duty brings,
 Tho' humble be the theme she sings—
 A pair of shooting-breeches.
 'Soon shall the tailor's subtle art
 Have fashioned them in every part—
 Have made them tight and spruce and smart,
 With twenty thousand stitches.
 'Mark then the moral of my song,—
 Oh! may your loves but prove as strong,
 And wear as well, and last as long,
 As these my shooting-breeches.
 'And when to ease this load of life,
 Of private care and public strife,
 My lot shall give to me a wife,
 I ask not rank or riches.
 'Temper, like thine, alone I pray,
 Temper, like thine, serenely gay,
 Inclined, like thee, to give away,
 Not wear herself—the breeches!'

The best of his verses of the serious and pathetic kind are the epitaph to his son, who died in 1820:—

' Though short thy span, God's unimpeach'd decrees,
 Which made that shorten'd span one long disease,
 Yet, merciful in chastening, gave thee scope
 For mild, redeeming virtues, faith and hope;
 Meek resignation; pious charity:
 And, since this world was not the world for thee,
 Far from thy path removed, with partial care,
 Strife, glory, gain, and pleasure's flowery snare,
 Bade earth's temptations pass thee harmless by,
 And fix'd on heaven thine unrevolted eye!
 ' Oh! mark'd from birth, and nurtured for the skies!
 In youth, with more than learning's wisdom, wise!
 As sainted martyrs, patient to endure!
 Simple as unwean'd infancy, and pure!
 Pure from all stain (save that of human clay,
 Which Christ's atoning blood hath wash'd away!)
 By mortal sufferings now no more oppress'd,
 Mount, sinless spirit, to thy destined rest!
 While I, reversed our nature's kindlier doom,
 Pour forth a father's sorrows on thy tomb.'

It would be both instructive and entertaining to trace the influence of Canning's literary taste and talents, with their peculiar cultivation and application, upon his oratory. To his confirmed habit of quizzing might be owing that quality of his speeches which led to their being occasionally mentioned as mere effusions of questionable facetiousness; whilst to the glowing fancy which gave birth to the graceful poetry reproduced in these pages, might be traced those ornate specimens of his eloquence which have caused him to be by many inconsiderately set down as a rhetorician. We refer, for humour, to the speech on the Indemnity Bill, in which occurs the unlucky allusion to the 'revered and ruptured Ogden;' for imagination and beauty of expression, to the description of the ships in Plymouth harbour; to the comparison of Pitt's mistaken worshippers to savages who only adore the sun when under an eclipse; and to the fine illustration of the old continental system recovering after the revolutionary deluge, as 'the spires and turrets of ancient establishments beginning to reappear above the subsiding waves.' Yet, surely even the chastest and severest school must admit that fancy and humour add point and strength to knowledge and truth. Nor, looking to modern examples, will it be denied, that literary acquirements and accomplishments may form the Corinthian capital of a parliamentary reputation, and indefinitely exalt the vocation and character of statesmanship.

- ART. V.—1. *Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Regulations affecting the Sanitary Condition of the Army, the Organization of Military Hospitals, and the Treatment of the Sick and Wounded, with Evidence and Appendix.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, 1858.
2. *Report to the Right Honourable Lord Panmure, G. C. B., &c., of the Proceedings of the Sanitary Commission dispatched to the Seat of War in the East, 1855–6.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, 1857.
3. *Statistical Reports on the Sickness, Mortality, and Invaliding among the Troops in the United Kingdom, the Mediterranean, and British America; prepared from the Records in the Army Medical Department and War Office Returns.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, 1853.
4. *Report to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, by the Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, upon the operation of the Common Lodging Houses Acts, 14 & 15 Vic. c. 28., and 16 & 17 Vic. c. 41., within the Metropolitan District.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Her Majesty's command, 1857.
5. *Thoughts on our Military Administration, in three Letters.* By a Field Officer. London: 1856.

THE hand of sanitary reform, which has long been busied upon the pauper's workhouse, the lunatic asylum, and the felon's gaol, and which has more recently begun to set in order the common lodging-house of the tramp, is now stretched forth to reach the barrack and the hospital of the soldier. In May, last year, a Royal Commission was issued by the Government of Lord Palmerston, to inquire into the regulations affecting the sanitary condition of the army, the organization of military hospitals, and the treatment of the sick and wounded.

This inquiry was not the result of popular clamour, but the spontaneous act of the Executive Government, solicitous that the sanitary improvements of modern science should be extended to the dwellings of our soldiers when in health, and to the hospitals which receive them in sickness. The Commissioners were selected with a view to their special aptitude for the duties to be

discharged by them. At their head was placed a former secretary-at-war, Mr. Sidney Herbert, who has at great personal sacrifice devoted his zealous and gratuitous services, with singular industry, impartiality, and perseverance, to the prosecution of this searching inquiry into the sanitary condition of the troops. With him were associated the late Mr. Augustus Stafford, whose chivalrous expedition to the Crimea we all remember, and whose premature death we all deplore; Colonel Sir Henry Storks, formerly commandant of the hospital at Smyrna, and subsequently of that at Scutari; Dr. Andrew Smith, the present director-general of the medical department of the army; Mr. Alexander, inspector-general of hospitals, attached to the light division in the Crimea; Sir Thomas Phillips, barrister; Sir James Clark, the eminent and popular physician in civil practice; Mr. James Ranald Martin, a medical officer in the East India Company's Service, well-known for his work on the diseases of soldiers in tropical climates, and for other services in the cause of sanitary reform as well in England as in India; and Dr. John Sutherland, whose successful labours as sanitary commissioner to the army in the Crimea we shall presently have occasion to notice. The secretary to this commission was Dr. T. Graham Balfour, formerly assistant-surgeon in the Grenadier Guards, and now surgeon to the Royal Military Asylum, at Chelsea, who had been for several years engaged in compiling the elaborate statistical reports (prepared from the Records of the Army Medical Department, and the War-office Returns), on the sickness, mortality, and invaliding of the troops at home and abroad, reports which were of the utmost value—nay, of absolute necessity—to the Commissioners in the prosecution of their investigations, by supplying them with the means of comparing the mortality of the soldiers in *England*, at a given period, with the mortality of those classes in civil life from which the army is recruited. It must be borne in mind that the comparison was necessarily confined to the respective mortality of military and of civil life in England, because the general registration of births, deaths, and marriages was extended to Scotland too recently to be available for the purposes of this inquiry; and Ireland, unhappily, has not even yet been favoured by the Legislature with a general law for registering the vital statistics of her people.

The Report of the Commissioners, with equally sound judgment and good taste, forbears from personal imputations upon any officer. It attacks no one: it deals simply with the mischiefs and abuses which it finds to exist under those military

regulations to which all officers are bound, by the rules of the service, to conform—mischiefs and abuses which it exposes boldly, but not vindictively, for they were not considered to be mischiefs and abuses, either by the authorities or by the public, at the time when the regulations which tolerate them were made. They were consonant to modes of thought and habits of life which have now happily passed away, but which prevailed when the public mind had not yet recognised those laws of nature which attest the truths of sanitary science. For it must not be forgotten, that thirty years ago the science of Public Health—‘Hygiene’—was practically unknown amongst us. The discoveries of Jenner, though at the outset violently opposed by the medical profession, had eventually triumphed over all obstacles, and deprived small-pox of its terrors as an epidemic disease. Other maladies of the epidemic class,—zymotic, as they are termed in the nomenclature of our day,—as the plague and sweating sickness of former times, and the celebrated gaol fever of a later period (the very name of which ought to have guided our forefathers to the discovery of its local causes), had been swept away by the progress of civilization. But the practitioners of medicine in that day too often failed or neglected to trace the *external causes* of disease. Reposing on the dogmatism of the lecture-room, that typhus and its kindred maladies are propagated by contact of the sick with the healthy, the professional mind of that generation, with some distinguished exceptions, was content to confine its inquiries to the beaten track of therapeutics, without wandering into an unexplored field of philosophical investigation. Fever hospitals were erected, and fever wards were established, by the liberality of the humane, which became excellent schools for studying the practice of medicine; but the fever nests which filled them with patients,—the filthy courts and alleys—the overcrowded, unventilated sleeping-rooms—the cellar dwellings—the defective and abominable sewerage—the pestiferous cesspools—the dearth and the impurity of water—remained unnoticed and unknown as the most destructive agents which prey on human life.

Nay, even now, when the great truths of sanitary science are universally admitted, it is found that in populous and educated communities, enjoying all the advantages of local government, these truths are grievously disregarded in practice. Municipal authorities shrink from enforcing collectively, in their official capacity, against each other and against their connexions, penal laws for the prevention of diseases of which they appre-

hend no immediate danger. Under the terror, indeed, of an epidemic actually committing its ravages, local boards bestir themselves for a season; but when the mischief has been done, and the panic has subsided, the old indifference to everything but the immediate outlay of money revives; 'Laissez faire' resumes its sway, and the Registrar-general, month after month, repeats to ears that will not hear, and to hearts that will not feel, the stern moral lesson taught in vain by his unerring and awful record of 'unnatural deaths'—of deaths from causes which are amenable to the control of man, but which man will not control.

'Within the shores of these islands the twenty-eight millions of people dwell who have not only supplied her armies and set her fleets in motion, but have manufactured innumerable products, and are employed in the investigation of scientific truths, and in the creation of works of inestimable value to the human race. These people do not live out half their days; *a hundred and forty thousand of them* die every year unnatural deaths; *two hundred and eighty thousand* are constantly suffering from actual diseases which do not prevail in healthy places; their strength is impaired in a thousand ways: their affections and intellects are disturbed, deranged, and diminished by the same agencies.' (*Registrar-General's Quarterly Report, December, 1857, p. 6.*)

We cannot then join those who demand the sacrifice of a special victim, in expiation of the mischiefs and abuses which have arisen out of the regulations affecting the sanitary condition of our troops, or the organization of the military hospitals. The discovery of these defects is the result of our own improved knowledge of the laws of public health. It is the result of advancing civilization, which enables us to rectify such abuses as are exposed in the Report of the Commissioners, which, though ably and succinctly drawn up, is necessarily of considerable length, inasmuch as it thoroughly exhausts all the subjects of inquiry. The evidence upon which their conclusions are founded is very voluminous; authentic and well-arranged statistical tables, carefully compiled by Dr. Farr, of the General Register Office, and by Dr. Balfour, the secretary to the Commissioners, fully establish the truth of the conclusions drawn from them. But any attempt at an analysis of these papers, or even a digest of the evidence, would far exceed the limits of an article of which the object is to exhibit to the general reader the principal topics treated of in the Report.

The soldier is recruited, generally at the age of nineteen, from

two classes, the farm labourer in the country and the journeyman in towns. His is a picked life; every man having any bodily infirmity, or apparent tendency to disease, is rejected; and the rejections amount to one-third of the whole number examined. The Guards are physically the very *élite* of the population, none but the strongest and best looking recruits being accepted: the men who have been rejected by the army remain in civil life; and of them between one-third and one-fourth have been rejected on account of diseases tending to shorten life.* Thus the civil population has lost that proportion of its good life which has gone into the army, and has retained the lives which were not good enough for the army. Moreover, the apparent health of the army is artificially maintained by the continued influx of fresh and healthy lives in the place of those which are weeded out by the process of invaliding; by which means a large number of men, whose physical powers are exhausted, are thrown back upon the civil population; while their removal lowers the rate of mortality in the army, though their deaths are in reality owing to the military service which undermined their health, and it increases the rate of mortality in the civil population with which the mortality in the army is contrasted. A similar result follows from returning upon the civil population those soldiers in whom, within three years from their enlistment, any infirmity or disease has manifested itself, which would have caused their rejection had it been developed when they were examined as recruits.

It would be obviously unfair to contrast the mortality of troops on foreign and colonial service with the mortality of the civil population at home; and the Commissioners have therefore confined themselves to a comparison of the mortality in the army *at home* with the mortality of the very classes of the civil population from which the army is recruited in the manner we have described, and of the same ages. The military returns are not taken beyond 1853, by reason of the occurrence of the Crimean War; for the disturbing effects of that event upon the statistics of the army at home extended much later than the termination of actual warfare, owing to the great reductions which took place after the peace, whereby all the least healthy men were removed from the service; and the recruits who had filled the vacancies caused by the casualties of war give a much more favourable sanitary character to the army generally, than under ordinary circumstances could be obtained. The interval between the

* Dr. Balfour's valuable Recruiting Statistics, Appendix, No. 66. to the Commissioners' Report.

termination of the war in the Crimea and the commencement of hostilities in India was not sufficiently long to furnish trustworthy data for legislative or administrative action; nor is there any reason to believe that any alterations in the condition of the soldier at home have been made which would render the statistics of the fifteen years, 1838 to 1853, inapplicable to the present time.

The rates of mortality in civil life, and with a population distributed in the same proportions as the soldiers, have been shown by Dr. Farr, from the returns of the Registrar-general, to be, in a rural population, 7·7 per 1000 living; in the general population of England and Wales, 9·2; and in Manchester, one of our most unhealthy towns, 12·4 per 1000; and by Sir A. Tulloch, from the same source, to be, among the population of 24 large towns, in most of which troops are quartered, 11·9 per 1000.

But the mortality in the household cavalry amounts to 11, in the cavalry of the line to 13·3, in the infantry of the line to 18·7, and in the foot guards to 20·4 per 1000; being all in excess of, and the last more than double, the mortality of the general population of England and Wales at the same ages.

Upon this most extraordinary, but incontrovertible fact, the whole discussion turns, and the chief object of the Commission is to discover the true causes of this incredible disparity, and to remove them.

Mr. Neison submitted to the Commissioners numerous tables, showing the mortality of various occupations in civil life, which are published in the Appendix to the Report, but into which we deem it unnecessary to enter. The result is, that the occupation which comes nearest to the army, as regards its mortality, is that of clerks. Close application to business, sedentary attitude, the want of exercise and of fresh air, render their employment one of the most unhealthy of all extensive occupations; and, strange as it must appear, it is necessary to have recourse to the most unhealthy occupations in order to institute any comparison in which the rates of mortality shall approximate to those prevailing among Her Majesty's troops; for, at present, the army stands at almost the head of unhealthy occupations in the United Kingdom. The Commissioners then proceeded to investigate the causes which have been assigned for this excessive mortality in an army of picked lives. To night duty, *per se*, as one of these causes, they attach but little comparative importance. The police, it is remarked, perform a night duty far more severe, and yet have a rate of mortality of only one half that of the infantry of the line, and less than one half that of the Guards.

The night duty of the policeman is continuous for eight hours out of twenty-four, and each man is on night duty upon an average eight months in the year. The night duty of the soldier comes round once in five nights. Yet it must be admitted that although the night duty of the policeman be much more severe, it is performed under more favourable conditions than that of the soldier. The policeman is well protected from the inclemency of the weather by good clothing, and by his waterproof cape, and is well shod. The soldier has, it is true, his great-coat, of which, in the words of General Lawrence, the quality is very inferior; it keeps out neither wind nor wet; on the contrary, its texture, like the sponge, is calculated to absorb and retain moisture. 'The boots,' says Serjeant Russell (Grenadier Guards), 'are very bad indeed. The boots of this year are the worst we have had for a long time. I never saw them so bad.' Thus ill-protected, the soldier is exposed during the night to alternations of heat, when sleeping in his wet clothes with his comrades in the warm guard-room, and of cold when sentry on his post—a mode of treatment from which the policeman is exempt. The agricultural labourers who, of the whole population, are neither the best clad, best fed, nor best housed, are nevertheless distinguished from all other classes—even the affluent—by the amount and variety of the exercise which they take in the open air, and by their greater longevity. The smaller mortality of the cavalry, as compared with the infantry, would appear to be in some degree attributable to the greater number of hours passed out of doors by the former, and to the greater variety of exercise which the care of his horse, and the nature of his service, requires of the trooper. The cavalry sword exercise is infinitely more invigorating and inspiring than the wearisome monotonous drill of the foot soldier. But it must not be forgotten that the cavalry are generally less crowded in their barracks than the infantry; the reduced strength of cavalry regiments, leaving greater space for the accommodation of each man.

The foot soldier, on the other hand, is the victim of listless idleness. His daily life is thus portrayed by Colonel Lindsay, for nine years adjutant in the Grenadier Guards:—

'Perhaps no living individual suffers more than he from *ennui*. He has no employment save his drill and his duties; these are of a most monotonous and uninteresting description, so much so that you cannot increase their amount without wearying and disgusting him: all he has to do is under restraint: he is not like a working man or an artisan: a working man digs, and his mind is his own; an artisan is interested in the work on which he is engaged; but a soldier must give you all his attention, and he has nothing to show for the

work done. He gets up at six. There is no drill before breakfast; he makes up his bed and cleans his things; he gets his breakfast at seven. He turns out for drill at half-past seven or eight; his drill may last an hour-and-a-half. If it be guard day there is no drill, except for defaulters. The men for duty are paraded at ten o'clock; that finishes his day's drill altogether. There is evening parade, which takes half-an-hour; and then his time is his own till tattoo, which is at nine in winter and ten in summer. That is the day of a soldier not on guard, or not belonging to the company which is out for minié practice.' (*Evidence*, p. 195.)

The mortality of the Guards has also been ascribed—and this is the popular explanation of it—rather to their vicious lives than to the vicious system under which they live. But a close analysis of the diseases and deaths among the military, and among the classes of civil life with which they are compared, does not justify this conclusion. Neither drunkenness nor licentiousness—of which the prevalence is not denied—will account for the greater mortality of soldiers—picked men from the very classes with which their mortality is contrasted. For there is no reason for supposing that the soldier is more addicted to drunkenness than the class in civil life to which he belongs, and with which the mortality in the army is compared. He receives no high wages at the end of the week wherewith to spend one or two days in drunkenness; nor would the strict discipline under which he lives enable him to do so habitually: but further,—and this seems to be conclusive,—the tables of mortality in the army do not indicate, as the causes of death, those diseases which are usually produced by intemperance in drink; and this is accounted for by the fact that drunkenness does not often destroy life until after the age when service in the army is over; it affects the mortality of the pensioners, but not that of the soldiers. And with regard to the libertinism to which the great mortality of the Guards is more popularly ascribed, it is to be remembered that pulmonary disease is the great scourge of the Guards: the deaths per 1000 of strength from this malady amount to 13·8, while the deaths in the infantry of the line from the same cause amount to 10·2, in the artillery to 8·7, and in the cavalry to 7·3. But if we look to the prevalence of disease caused by libertinism in these several branches of the service, we find the admissions of syphilitic cases into hospital per 1000 of strength amount, in the artillery, to 463; infantry of the line, to 277; foot guards, to 250; and cavalry, to 206. This dispels the popular fallacy that the great mortality in the Guards arises from licentiousness. When, indeed, a sufficient cause has been found, it may not be necessary to look for another; but no such sufficient cause having yet been discovered, we are led

now to seek it in the sanitary condition of the barrack in which the soldier passes his monotonous inactive life.

We find, at the outset of these inquiries, the usual result of over-crowding, non-ventilation, defective sewerage, and the other well-known local causes of pestilence, in the fact that, in the cholera epidemic of 1849, the troops in London,—with the exception of those stationed in the Wellington Barracks, in St. James's Park, the most open and healthiest spot in the district,—suffered in a much larger proportion than the civil population of the parishes in which the barracks are situated. And to the same local causes of disease may be attributed the mortality from fever in barracks in ordinary years, which much exceeds that of the surrounding civil population in those years also. But a still more startling fact arrests our attention before proceeding further—the fact that that particular form of pulmonary disease which is the genuine offspring of a vitiated and polluted atmosphere, especially when superadded to a certain amount of exposure, actually carries off annually a number of men in the Infantry nearly equalling, and in the Guards absolutely exceeding, the proportionate number of civilians of the same age who die of all diseases put together.

The barrack-room, at once the day-room and the dormitory of its inmates, is crowded, confined, and ill-ventilated; in it the men not only sleep, but take, or are expected to take, their meals. The minimum cubic space allowed by regulation to each man is only 400 feet, and in the majority of cases this minimum is not obtained, there being in many barracks a deficiency of a third, and in some a deficiency of more than half, of the space nominally allowed by regulation. The occupation of the barrack-room by inmates during the day prevents its being thoroughly purified before the return of night, when the wooden ‘tubs’ are introduced, the stench from which is most prejudicial to health. If, as is sometimes the case, they are not introduced into the room, but are placed in the passage, the effect is scarcely less injurious, for the poisonous air generated by them in the passage combines with that of the barrack-room every time the door is opened. The intensity of this nuisance in barracks is complained of, and its continuance denounced, by the Quartermaster-general, Sir Richard Airey; by Serjeant Fenton, of the Artillery; by Serjeant Sotheran, of the 85th; by Colonel Jebb, of the Engineers, Inspector-general of Prisons; by Colonel Lindsay, of the Grenadier Guards; and by Dr. Balfour, who found it in full activity at the Royal Military Asylum—an establishment conducted on the same system as a barrack. Thanks to this energetic officer, an improved system now has been in operation in that establishment for

six years, and we may now reasonably hope for the speedy annihilation everywhere else of this relic of barbarism, which has too long outlived the good old times to which it appropriately belonged, when our soldiers were packed two in a bed, when their beds were ranged in tiers above each other, and when the soldier was flogged by repeated instalments—during the intervals between which he was necessarily in hospital—until he had received the whole number of lashes to which he had been sentenced, if it was found that he was physically unable to undergo the infliction of the whole punishment at one time. The want of windows at opposite sides or ends of the room renders the means of ventilation very insufficient; though the number of men sleeping in it makes a free circulation of air the more needful. Even when ventilators exist, they are frequently stopped by the men themselves, who belong to a class little conscious of the advantages of ventilation, and who have from their youth been accustomed to look to the exclusion of external air as being, in the absence of fuel, the best means of obtaining warmth. Sometimes barrack-rooms are in the basement, approached by descending steps from the natural surface level, the tops of the windows, which open at one side only of the rooms, being little, if at all, above that level; and in low rooms thus situated a number of men may be found lodged in beds so closely ranged that the side of one touches the side of the other. The consequence is, that the soldier sleeps in the fœtid and unwholesome atmosphere of an over-crowded and ill-ventilated room, till the habitual breathing of a polluted atmosphere undermines his health, and produces those fatal results from pulmonary disease which we have already commemorated.

However extraordinary it may appear, after this description of the barrack-room, it is nevertheless true that doubts have been expressed whether the soldiers themselves would prefer, or even make use of, a separate day-room in which to take their meals and pass their time, instead of the dormitory which at present serves them for all purposes. But these doubts have been satisfactorily removed by the eagerness with which the privates of the Grenadier Guards availed themselves of the accommodation of a large room temporarily unoccupied, which had been for a time appointed to their use as a day-room. ‘It was watched,’ says Colonel Lindsay, ‘to see whether this room would be used; and it was crammed; even that large room, so that there was ‘not room for the men.’ Serjeant Sotheran, of the 85th, who had seen beds in a barrack-room so closely packed as to be only six inches apart, said that a day-room separate from the sleeping-room would be a great advantage, and proceeded to describe the

accommodation afforded to the men under the existing system in these words :— ‘ They are confined to one room all the day ; ‘ they have very little room to walk up and down ; there is a ‘ row of tables up the centre, and a row of beds on each side, ‘ and the men are cramped.’ ‘ It is rather too much,’ says Sir John MacNeill, ‘ that our soldiers should be worse lodged than ‘ our paupers ;’ while, according to another witness, the soldier never knows a healthy home, as regards air and space, until he commits some crime which places him in the thoroughly ventilated cell of a military prison ; and a third declares that a soldier’s barrack-room at present has not the least pretensions to the comforts of an ordinary dwelling-house ; and, what is infinitely more disgraceful, there is not even the attempt made to introduce into it the decencies of civilized life. The Commissioners accordingly recommend that a minimum space of 600 cubic feet be allotted to each man in his barrack-room, and that at least three feet be allowed between each bed ; for experience proves that a sufficient interval between the beds is of more importance to health than the amount of cubic space given by the altitude of the room. The importance of this consideration is best explained by the fact that a man may be suffocated in a crowd in the open air, notwithstanding the cubic space above him is immeasurable. They also recommend the construction of a large day-room, well warmed and sufficiently lighted, divided, if thought necessary, into four compartments ; together with other reforms for introducing into barracks the ordinary conveniences of life, and proper means and appliances for securing to the inmates the advantages of personal cleanliness and decency.

The influence of over-crowding in the production of zymotic disease among troops was exemplified in France, during the reign of King Louis Philippe, in a very remarkable manner. The experiment was so complete, and it was repeated annually with such uniform results, that we transcribe it for the satisfaction of those who might otherwise be sceptical as to the efficacy of over-crowding as an agent for the destruction of health :—

‘ Pendant la période de 1843 à 1847 inclusivement, j’ai constaté chaque année, à l’hôpital militaire de Versailles, une épidémie meurtrière de fièvres typhoïdes sévissant vers le mois d’Octobre, exclusivement parmi les malades qui me venaient de la garnison de Saint Cloud. Cette épidémie avait ceci de remarquable qu’elle se manifestait tous les ans, huit jours après l’arrivée de l’ex-roi, et qu’elle disparaissait immédiatement après son départ de Saint Cloud, sans atteindre jamais ni la population civile, ni les officiers, ni même les sous-officiers, bien que ces derniers habitassent la même caserne que les caporaux et

soldats. Voici quelques faits capables de donner la clef de l'énigme pathogénique.

'La garnison de Saint Cloud, en temps ordinaire, se composait de quatre à cinq cents hommes, et n'avait presque pas de malades; dès que le roi arrivait, la garnison était portée à douze cents. Les hommes étaient alors entassés dans des chambres étroites et mal aérées, tandis que les sous-officiers, d'ailleurs mieux nourris et moins fatigués de service, avaient toujours au moins une chambre pour deux hommes.'*

The life of a soldier, who is lodged with hundreds of his comrades in a barrack, is essentially unnatural and artificial; he has no family to provide for; he is not in any sense his own master; he is housed, clothed, fed, and attended in sickness, under regulations over which he has no control; and for the mischievous effects of which, if such arise, he is in no way responsible; he has in view none of those objects for which other men of the class from which he springs live and work; the little military employment, or duty, which he goes through without interest, is so irksome and fruitless, that it does not occupy his mind, and could not be augmented, in order to diminish the number of his hours of idleness, without amounting to actual punishment, to which purpose it is literally applied in practice. To regulate happily an existence so completely abnormal, requires much more care, skill, and attention than have yet been bestowed upon it in this country. But the first step towards raising his character morally and intellectually, will be to inspire him with some sense of self-respect, which is wholly incompatible with the mode of life to which he is condemned by the existing barrack arrangements—by rendering his home sufficiently decent and comfortable to withdraw him from the gin palace, the beer-shop, and the canteen. No prodigality is so wasteful and mischievous as the parsimony which continues an annual outlay for the repair and maintenance in their present defective condition of barracks, the existing arrangements of which are so essentially bad as to undermine the health and destroy the lives of the troops. Nothing is more costly to the nation than the annual loss of trained soldiers from ill health and mortality; and though the saving which would result from a better system be indirect, and therefore difficult to estimate, yet, looking at the question as a matter of finance alone, money judiciously laid out in promoting the health and comfort of the troops, makes an ample return to the country. The cost for the accommodation of the *men* in a barrack amounts to but one fourth part of the whole; and it is

* *Essai sur les Loix Pathologiques de la Mortalité*, par M. Boudin. *Annales d'Hygiène Publique*, vol. xxxix. p. 379.

only upon this fourth part that any increase of outlay would be required to give the additional or better arranged accommodation which the health of the men imperatively demands.

The price to the public of a trained soldier baffles calculation. It has been estimated at sums varying from 30*l.* to 100*l.* The cost of the new recruit does not, like the price of the trooper's horse, strike the eye of the financier in the shape of a round sum of thirty pounds' to be paid down on the nail; but it is made up of numerous petty payments. It may perhaps be owing to this difference, that more careful provision has been made by the existing barrack regulations, for the sanitary condition of the barrack-stable than for that of the barrack-room. 'The ventilation of the stables,' say the regulations, 'in cavalry barracks, is an object of great importance; and each building having, under the superintendence of the principal veterinary surgeon, received the requisite degree of ventilation by the mode best adapted to its particular structure, commanding officers are held responsible that this is not counteracted by the bad judgment and ill-directed zeal of those who have the immediate care of the horses.'

The pay of the private soldier is nominally thirteen-pence per day; but this sum never reaches his pocket, because he is paid upon what in civil life is called the truck system; in conformity with which the greater part of this nominal daily pay is withheld from him in order to defray the cost of food, and other necessities supplied to him by the public. This is a system which, besides its tendency to engender suspicion and distrust, is objectionable on account of the intricate and cumbrous accounts which must be kept of the goods supplied to each individual soldier, and of the deductions from his pay on account of them. 'The stoppages from the pay of the soldier,' says Sir Charles Trevelyan, 'for the rations supplied to him, involve settlements of accounts of so operose and cumbrous a nature, that although they are gone through in time of peace at the cost of an enormous waste of labour, the whole system is immediately abandoned at the breaking out of war.' The Commissioners therefore recommend one uniform rate of stoppage, both at home and abroad, the result of which will be that the soldier will receive, whether at home or abroad, in peace or in war, on board ship or in hospital, a uniform *net* balance of pay, and a uniform ration, sufficient both in quantity and quality to provide him with three meals, and to keep him in health and efficiency.

But the food having been supplied, only one mode of cooking it is recognised or provided by regulation. Coppers for boiling

exist in every barrack, but in the great majority of barracks no meat can be dressed in any other way. According to the testimony of Sir Richard Airey, which agrees exactly with that of Surgeon-Major Brown, of the Grenadier Guards, and a host of other witnesses on this subject, a company is generally provided with two boilers, in one of which the soldiers boil their meat, and in the other their potatoes; they have nothing else; a man goes on with it from the day he enlists till he is discharged; he lives upon boiled meat for twenty-one years. 'I am persuaded, having commanded a regiment fourteen years, that the men are perfectly sickened with it. I have seen the meat, after it has been boiled down to shreds, thrown away; the men would not look at it.' It appears that in some regiments the men, in order to obtain some variety in the mode of cooking their meat, of the importance and value of which all seem to be fully sensible, send their meat at their own expense to be dressed by private bakers, whom they contrive to pay by stinting themselves in their allowance of vegetables,—a practice which, with reference to the component parts of the ration, may be prejudicial to health. But this is not the general rule in the army; for Serjeant Sotheran, of the 85th, after stating that in the Infantry the meat is always boiled, and that the men complain of the sameness of the cooking, being asked, 'Do your men never send out meat to be baked?' answers, 'No; they cannot afford it.' Serjeant Russell, of the Grenadier Guards, bears witness to the practice of sending out the rations to a bake-house, and paying the expense out of the vegetable money; but adds that at the time when he was giving his evidence (June, 1857) a change was taking place; they were getting means provided for baking and roasting, which previously there were not; so that at that time they were becoming enabled to vary day by day their mode of cooking. This appears, from the evidence of Colonel Lindsay, to have been accomplished by the erection of ovens in the wing of the Wellington Barracks, recently built in conformity with the recommendation of the Barrack Committee of the House of Commons, in 1855. A striking example of the beneficial results which are gained to health, by adopting a greater variety of cooking, is furnished in the evidence of Dr. Balfour. This reform which, at his suggestion, was upwards of eight years ago introduced into the Royal Military Asylum—an institution in all respects, except the age of its inmates, the very epitome of a barrack—coupled with improved ventilation, greater space between the beds in the dormitories, and ample means of personal ablution, diminished the sickness by about one third, and the mortality by one half, without any augmentation of the ration, and with a positive dimi-

nution of expense. And at the same time it should be remarked, that the previous dietary of the inmates of the asylum had been less monotonous than that of soldiers in barracks.

The same success has rewarded the adoption of sanitary reforms wherever they have been completely carried out; and where the evils of cesspools, accumulations of filth, bad drainage, want of proper ventilation, overcrowding, personal uncleanness, and similar abominations are not allowed to exist. In a former Number* we cited numerous instances of this success, as exemplified in the immunity from zymotic diseases prevailing in their immediate neighbourhood, of model lodging-houses, prisons, lunatic asylums, and other public institutions, which have been constructed and arranged with a due regard to the health of their numerous inmates. The same happy results have been more recently obtained in the common lodging-houses of the very poorest classes of the London population, since the Legislature has placed the abodes of vagrants and mendicants under sanitary regulations, enforced by the metropolitan police. We learn from the last report of Captain Harris, the Assistant-Commissioner of Police, to whose supervision the enforcement of these regulations is intrusted, that before their enactment the evils existing in the lodging-houses of the poor were beyond description. Crowded and filthy, without water or ventilation, without the least regard to cleanliness or decency, they were hot-beds of disease, misery, and crime. Under the operation of the Act, the evils attending such houses have been in a great degree removed or abated. The medical officers of health are unanimous in testifying to the great diminution of sickness from the sanitary precautions exercised in these houses, notwithstanding zymotic diseases still prevail amongst the poor in their immediate neighbourhood. And in the cholera epidemic of 1854 the mortality in the common lodging-houses under inspection amounted only to about one-sixth of the rate of cholera mortality in the whole metropolis.

All the metropolitan model lodging-houses escaped the cholera epidemic of 1854, though it prevailed in the districts in which they were situated. There was only one exception,—the case of a family of ten persons living in the basement of one of the Albert Street dwellings, with about 276 cubic feet of space for each inmate; and this overcrowding led to four deaths among them from cholera. These model lodging-houses, constructed upon good sanitary principles, are free from nuisances of all kinds, have an abundant supply of water and adequate means of

ventilation; some of them are of large dimensions, being occupied by from 300 to 700 persons of all ages, and the mortality is little above one half that of the metropolis. To the objection that these results are obtained only in buildings which, like the model lodging-houses, have been constructed expressly with a view to health, the answer is ready—barracks should also be built expressly with a view to health; and, in fact, prisons, lunatic asylums, and workhouses are expressly constructed with a view to this object, and in them this object is attained. Nor must it be forgotten, that to introduce sanitary improvements into the common lodging-houses of the lowest and least respectable classes of the population, the interposition of the Legislature was necessary, whose enactments, not unfrequently resisted by all parties immediately affected by them, could only be carried into execution through the agency of the police. ‘But no such difficulty presents itself in the case of the barracks, which are the property of the Crown, and the inhabitants of which are men often drawn from some of the best portions of the labouring classes, who are serving your Majesty, and for whose health and wellbeing the Government are responsible.’

Dr. Sutherland being asked, ‘Is there any reason, in your estimation, why barracks could not be rendered as healthy as the buildings of the classes you have described?’ answered, ‘None whatever. I have heard all the reasons usually assigned for the extravagantly high mortality existing in the army, and I can see no reason whatever why, if sanitary measures were applied with due intelligence to barracks, most of the excessive mortality in the army might not be swept away.’ ‘And these measures, fortunately,’ say the Commissioners, ‘can be applied by order and at once, without ratepayers to be consulted or Acts of Parliament to be obtained.’

The lamentably defective regulations of the British Army, in regard to the preservation of health, under which all the mischiefs exposed in the Commissioners’ Report have grown up, are attributable in a great degree to the fact that they were made at a time when sanitary science was not understood. Not originally contemplating the prevention of sickness, they make no provision for this, the main object of all sanitary regulations. Of these defects in the present system we now proceed to select some practical illustrations.

For many years the pestilential state of the Tower Ditch was represented by the medical officers of the Guards as a cause of the great prevalence of fever in the garrison: the military authorities, however, declined to drain the ditch; and the nuisance continued until, after some years, typhus being very prevalent in

the battalion of Guards quartered there, the inhabitants of Tower Hill became alarmed lest the disease should spread to them; they applied the pressure of public opinion; the ditch was drained, which was followed by a favourable change in the type of fevers, and a marked diminution in the fatal character and in the number of cases. A supply of good water was in the same way introduced, under the apprehension of impending cholera, in 1849, after the remonstrances of the medical officers had been for years neglected, during which time the men drank water taken from the Thames, immediately opposite the Tower, and filtered through coarse gravel, but which remained so full of animalcules that the witness avoided using it even for washing until it had been boiled. Again, when it was proposed, for health's sake, fever prevailing among the men, and cholera threatening, to move the troops from the old to the newly erected barrack in the Tower, in which some blankets had been temporarily placed, and to transfer the latter to the quarters vacated by the men, the proposal was negatived on the ground that the blankets would be injured by the damp. Fortunately this objection was brought under the notice of the Duke of Wellington, and the new barrack was given up to the troops. Mr. Alexander, Inspector-general of Hospitals, made requisitions officially to the general commanding in the field, for stores at Aladyn: the requisitions went to the General of Division, and the answer returned was, that the medical officer 'had better keep his suggestions and strictures till they were called for.' In a hot climate, a commanding officer having selected for his parades an hour of the day that would be detrimental to the health of his men, the medical officer's remonstrance was met by an answer to the effect that, 'When your opinion is wanted, you will be asked for it.'

Until very recently, the magnificent men and horses of the Household Cavalry were actually condemned, when quartered at Knightsbridge, to drink the foul contents of the Serpentine! Towards midsummer, the numbers of bathers and washers in that stagnant pool are so numerous, that its waters become little better than filthy soap-suds. Nevertheless, pipes laid down by the engineering department conveyed to tanks within the barracks at Knightsbridge the sole supply of water vouchsafed to the Horse Guards, to the men, women, children, and horses quartered there. At last, in the heat of an unusually hot autumn, the grievance became so unbearable that both man and beast revolted against it. The men quietly borrowed their drinking water from the public houses in the neighbourhood, the horses drank sparingly, lost condition, and finally refused to

drink at all. This mutinous conduct on the part of the animals being persevered in, necessitated prompt action if their lives were to be saved. An officer of the Quartermaster-general's department was despatched with almost unprofessional alacrity to examine and report upon the Serpentine lymph; he caused the main tank to be opened, peeped incautiously into it, and staggered back, asphyxiated by the miasma which burst forth. His report caused the military authorities to consent that potable water should be at once laid on for the use of the soldiers from the main which supplied every other human being in Knightsbridge. But the unhappy inspector died of fever a few days afterwards, and the Life Guardsmen, who tell the story, declare that the seasoned veteran perished from his want of caution in smelling the water which they and their horses had been condemned to drink for years.

So ill-constructed, ill-drained, and ill-ventilated are these barracks in which the finest cavalry in the world are crowded away, that they are almost always the seats of diseases incidental to want of good air and cleanliness. The Report of the Registrar-general for May mentions that four children of the same parents perished of scarlatina, within a few days of each other, in their walls.

Even at the present time when public attention has been directed to the subject, and it is of the utmost importance that the troops concentrated for embarkation to India should be in perfect health, we read in the military intelligence of the '*Times*' (10th June) the following passage:—

'For some time past serious complaints have been made by the military authorities connected with the several branches of the service at Chatham of the scarcity of water in that garrison, and this scarcity has within the last week increased to such an extent that garrison orders have been issued directing that the troops are to discontinue their baths in the several ablution rooms, and that every precaution be taken to prevent any waste of water. The garrison is supplied with water from several old wells and tanks which have been in use for some period, and, although there are waterworks established for the supply of the whole of the barracks, the authorities have not yet taken the necessary steps to obtain an unlimited supply from that source. In addition to the inconvenience arising from a deficiency of water, the barracks at Chatham are in a very crowded state. The authorities have attempted to get over the difficulty by placing several hundred troops under canvas, but owing to the continued arrival of recruits to join the various East India regiments at Chatham the number of men occupying the barrack-rooms is still disproportionably large. At Brompton barracks a large portion of the building has been set apart for a hospital,

in which about 200 sick soldiers are packed in the very centre of a barrack crowded with troops. Already there have been several cases of measles and smallpox among the troops, caused, there is no doubt, by the overcrowding of the men.'

The truth is, that the barrack accommodation of the United Kingdom is utterly insufficient to provide healthy quarters for any considerable body of troops. Even in the heart of the metropolis, barracks like those in Portman Street are a scandal and a disgrace, and the health and efficiency of the army peremptorily require that large additional barracks shall be erected on good sanitary principles.

The practical value of military hygiene, when skilfully applied, was strikingly exhibited in the comparative health of the army in the first and second winters of the Crimean campaign. We state the facts in the earnest language of Miss Nightingale, whose name would alone command our respectful attention, even if we did not know that turning from the pursuits which ordinarily attract those who are gifted with social position and ample fortune, she with singular devotion has given thirteen years of her life to avert and alleviate the sufferings of the hospital patient. Her humane solicitude for the relief of sickness and disease has given her an imperishable name amongst the benefactors of mankind; but the masterly vigour with which she has contributed to promote the objects of this inquiry does equal honour to her administrative abilities and her intellectual powers. She thus emphatically exposes the sanitary failures of the British military system:—

'The barrack and the military hospital exist at home and in the colonies, as tests of our sanitary condition in peace; and the histories of the Peninsular war, of Walcheren, and of the late Crimean expedition, exist as tests of our sanitary condition in the state of war. We have much more information on the sanitary history of the Crimean campaign than we have on any other. It is a complete history—history does not afford its equal—of an army, after a great disaster, arising from neglects, having been brought into the highest state of health and efficiency. It is the whole experiment on a colossal scale. In all other examples the last step has been wanting to complete the solution of the problem. We had, in the first seven months of the Crimean campaign, a mortality among the troops at the rate of sixty per cent. per annum, *from disease alone*; a rate of mortality which exceeds that of the great plague in the population of London, and a higher ratio than the mortality in cholera to the attacks; that is to say, there died, out of the army in the Crimea, an annual rate greater than ordinarily die, in time of pestilence, out of the sick. We had, during the *last* six months of the war, a mortality among our *sick* not much more than that among our *healthy* Guards

at home, and a mortality among our troops in the last five months two-thirds only of what it is among our troops at home. Is not this the most complete experiment in army hygiene? We cannot try this experiment over again for the benefit of inquirers at home, like a chemical experiment. It must be brought forward as an historical example.'

She tells us that during November and December, 1854, and January and half February, 1855, diseases of the scorbutic kind, such as generally arise from bad food, deficient clothing, fatigue, exposure, and damp, prevailed; but that during the latter part of February, March, and April, 1855, the scorbutic kind declined, and diseases of the malarial type,—typhoid, continued and remittent fever, dysentery, diarrhoea, and cholera—began to prevail to a great extent, the result of bad drainage, bad ventilation, overcrowding, nuisances, organic effluvia, malaria, and damp. The day when Dr. Sutherland and his brethren, the Sanitary Commissioners, commenced their operations was the 17th of March, 1855, and the epoch is thus emphatically noticed in the evidence of Miss Nightingale:—

'The sanitary conditions of the hospitals at Scutari were inferior in point of crowding, ventilation, drainage, and cleanliness, up to the middle of March, 1855, to any civil hospital, or to the poorest homes in the worst parts of the civil population of any large town I have ever seen. After the sanitary works, undertaken at that date, were executed, I know no buildings in the world which I could compare with them in these points, the original defect of construction of course excepted.'

It follows, that if the same amount of sanitary skill should be applied to improve the condition of the soldier in barracks and in hospitals at home, as wrought so beneficial a change in the condition of the army in the Crimea, such an innovation upon the established regulations of the service would be rewarded with the same success.

'With regard to overcrowding, both for barracks and hospitals, the regulation for our service is overcrowding. But even the regulation space was not adhered to. The men were laid on paillasses on the floor, as close as they could lie. The sanitary condition of the buildings was extremely defective. It is impossible to describe the state of the atmosphere of the barrack hospital at night. I have been well acquainted with the dwellings of the worst parts of most of the great cities in Europe, but have never been in any atmosphere which I could compare with it.'

She then particularises with horrible minuteness the various morbid influences which prevailed in and around the hospitals: the poisonous sewerage—the accumulations of filth, vermin,

and foul air—the decomposed animal and vegetable matter—the impure water, in the tank supplying which were seen the foul hospital dresses—the absence of proper and cleanly utensils, and the use of the regulation tubs, the effect of which on the atmosphere of the wards was past description—the walls and ceilings saturated with organic matter—the burial of the dead so close to the hospital as to poison the air, and many other details of the same disgusting character.

‘The sick might have been loaded with medical comforts, attended by the first medical men of the age. Under such sanitary conditions as existed at Scutari, they had not a chance. . . . I am bound to say that the military hospitals I have seen in England,—Portsmouth, Chatham, Brompton,—are almost as much in want of certain sanitary works as Scutari.’

And this last statement is completely borne out by the members of the Sanitary Commission, who minutely inspected the hospitals at Chatham and at Portsmouth, which, as being two principal stations, they presumed might be taken as fair specimens of army hospitals at home. For they report, that when the wards of Fort Pitt Hospital, at Chatham, are full, the allowance of space is very small, smaller in fact than that laid down in the hospital regulations; and being ill ventilated, they are remarkably foul in the morning. The walls are not painted sufficiently often, because, says the purveyor, ‘they do not look ‘after the health, but after the wood-work;’ and this has an ill effect upon the patients. For want of proper drainage, a most horrible stench is produced close to one of the wards and to the kitchen, where great annoyance is necessarily experienced from the smell. Immediately outside the hospital gate is a nuisance, the effect of which is thus described: ‘I ‘can assure the Commissioners,’ says a witness, ‘I have almost ‘fainted from the horrible smell. It has drawn tears from my ‘eyes worse than any hartshorn bottle that I ever put to my ‘nose. When the wind is in a particular direction, I can smell ‘it for a quarter of a mile.’ It is about twenty yards from the ‘casemate, and a hundred from the General Hospital. I have ‘smelt it on the Parade.’ At Brompton Hospital, the wards being faulty in construction, have no means of thorough ventilation, and are dependent on what can be supplied artificially; they are not properly supplied with cupboards, so that the clothes and effects of the patients, including blacking brushes, are stowed with pewter utensils, creating more smell and impurity, under the beds. No cup, saucer, or earthenware mug is issued, nor any glass, even for the purpose of taking medicine. But the patient is supplied with a plate and with an earthenware

bowl, out of which, at breakfast, he drinks his tea and coffee, and his soup and beer at dinner. The patients have also a tin mug, which is soon corroded, and presents a nauseous appearance, out of which they refuse to drink; nor is it possible to drink any hot liquid from these mugs, because they absorb and retain the heat, and become too hot to admit of contact with the lips. The ablutions are performed in a lavatory, where a long trough contains basins into which water can be turned: for patients who are too ill to leave their beds, a basin and towel are brought, one basin being allowed to each ward; the round towels are supplied by one department of issue, and the square by another. The kitchens in these hospitals are very defective; that in Fort Pitt Hospital being extremely confined and very offensive, from the contiguous nuisance, which has already been noticed. There are no kitchen ranges, nor any means of roasting or baking, except in a small adjoining room, used as a kitchen for extras, where there are means of baking about sixteen puddings at a time, and a gridiron for broiling mutton chops. The ordinary rations are, as in barracks, habitually boiled in large coppers, and no change or variety in the preparation of their food can be effected for the sick. Before a certain hour—ten or half-past ten—in the morning, when the extras for the day are provided, it is not possible to give chicken or beef-tea to a patient requiring immediate support; the regulations not permitting any stock of meat to be kept in the hospitals, nor more to be purchased than the exact amount prescribed for the day's use of the patients. The object of the regulation is to guard against purloining the meat; and this object is secured, not by keeping a supply for emergencies in proper custody, under lock and key, but by there being no meat to purloin. The Commissioners enter into very minute details on the subject of the Chatham hospitals, as being the chief hospitals of the army, and which suffer not from casual deficiency in some one department, but from insufficient accommodation and supply pervading every branch of the establishments. They have, in justice to Dr. Andrew Smith, inserted in their Appendix a memorandum submitted by that gentleman in June, 1843, in which various defects in these hospitals are exposed in detail; and they significantly remark, that 'the worst and most dangerous nuisances then complained of have not been removed to this day.'

The condition and appliances of the Melville (Naval) Hospital at Chatham, into which the sick from the Marines are received, present a marked contrast with the army hospitals. Whether the superiority of the naval hospital be attributable to

the greater concentration of administrative power and responsibility, with professional knowledge and experience of the wants of the service in the Board of Admiralty, or to any other cause, the fact is indisputable. The building is well adapted to its purpose and to the requirements of the patients, with ample space between the beds; the ventilation is excellent, and the wards, being fresh painted, are admirably clean and very cheerful. An ample supply of water furnishes the lavatories, and keeps the other needful appurtenances of each ward perfectly clean and sweet. The kitchens are excellent, and enable the patients to have roast as well as boiled meat. The supply of furniture, crockery, glass, &c. is far more ample and of better quality than in the army hospitals. Female nurses are employed in the naval hospitals; and Miss Nightingale remarks, that the contrast between these and military hospitals, where there are no female nurses, is most striking in point of order and cleanliness. Two members of the Commission inspected the military hospital at Portsmouth and the neighbouring naval hospital at Haslar:—

‘The former has been constructed on a very defective plan; the wards are too long between the windows from back to front; the means of ventilation are wholly inadequate; the cubic space for each patient is about half of what it should be; the hospital is not clean, and as there are no female nurses, it is destitute of that neatness and order observed at Haslar. The ablution room is badly lighted, and there is no proper bath accommodation. This hospital affords, in every respect, a very striking contrast in its sanitary condition to Haslar Hospital, though there are some points in which the latter would admit of improvement. The Naval Hospital, at Haslar, was beautifully clean in every part; the floors well rubbed, the walls and ceilings brightly whitewashed, and the light abundant. The officers’ quarters are carpeted and suitably furnished. The kitchens are in the basement of the building; they were in excellent condition, amply provided with boilers, and along one side was a large iron range, for cooking by gas. Female nurses are employed in all the wards, and, judging from the neatness and cleanliness around the sick, they appear to be efficient in their duties.’

With respect to the internal supply and service of the hospitals, the same contrast which had been noticed between the Melville Hospital and the army hospitals at Chatham, was remarked between Haslar and the neighbouring army hospital at Portsmouth. And this same contrast had been pointed out as existing in June, 1843, by Dr. Andrew Smith, in the memorandum already referred to.

The Commissioners have, at considerable length, recapitulated the various evils which recent experience and these investiga-

tions have brought to light, affecting the sanitary condition of the army; and they have, after much consideration, proposed an appropriate remedy for each. But the recommendation, which we regard as being of paramount importance to all the rest, is that for reconstructing, and giving a higher position to, the medical department in the Army. We are happy to observe, that the Commander-in-chief has, without loss of time, abolished the inequality in point of relative rank between the medical and the other officers of the army — an odious distinction justly condemned by the Commissioners. Without adequate pay and fair promotion, it cannot be expected that the army medical department will attract to its ranks men of the requisite professional ability, of cultivated minds, and of scientific knowledge; and we rejoice that the Commissioners have proposed reforms well calculated to secure this great object.

Sanitary science, and the skill to apply it judiciously for the preservation of the general health, under every variety of climate and circumstances, should be qualifications indispensable for the military medical officer, who should no longer be a mere obtrusive volunteer adviser, whose counsel in this respect may be, as we see it has been, adopted or rejected according to the caprice of the officer commanding; and a heavy responsibility should be fastened upon the commander, who, without overpowering military or strategical reasons, should disregard the advice deliberately recorded by the sanitary officer charged with the health of the troops, whether at home or abroad, in the camp, in the barrack, or in the hospital.

We attach the greatest value to the recommendations of the Commissioners, that in order to secure that sanitary considerations shall not be overlooked in the choice of sites for encampments, hospitals, or barracks, or in any matter involving the health of the troops, such as water supply, drainage, food, clothing, &c., medical officers be invariably consulted; and in order to fix on commanding officers and on medical officers the responsibility properly belonging to each, that the medical officer shall be required to give his advice in writing, the commanding officer to affix in writing his reasons for rejecting it, if he think fit to do so, and to transmit the document to proper authority; that in order to secure to the commanding officer of an army in the field the most effective sanitary advice, and to relieve the principal medical officer of duties which his other avocations leave him no time to perform, a sanitary officer be appointed to act under the authority of the principal medical officer, but to be attached to the staff of the Quartermaster-

general. The Commissioners also propose that a sanitary officer should be one of the three colleagues whom they recommend to be associated with the Director-general of the army medical department in London. These three officers, selected for their eminence in medical, sanitary, and statistical knowledge respectively, would act as the council of the Director-general. Thus by giving to sanitary science the means of enforcing the laws of public hygiene, and thereby preventing disease, we shall secure to the troops the advantage of participating in the improved health and greater longevity which the progress of civilization is bestowing upon all other classes of the community. The beneficial effects of advancing civilization, in promoting the health and prolonging the life of man, are displayed with singular clearness and ability in Southwood Smith's Lectures on Epidemics considered with reference to their common nature, and to climate and civilization. A very careful analysis, appended to these lectures by Mr. Finlaison, of the Government Tontines of 1693 and 1790, shows, that in the interval between the close of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, human life had, in this country, gained an addition equivalent to one-fourth part of its whole term.

Several witnesses were examined on the subject of dress. It is obvious that the clothing of the troops should be adapted to the climate in which they are serving, and that no part of their head-gear or body-clothes should, in deference to sartorial æsthetics, be allowed to endanger health or impede the free use of the limbs. It appears that the quality of the materials is discreditable to a manufacturing nation; and that a reform in this particular is essential to the well-being of the soldier; which reform would be effected by subjecting the materials, before issuing them for use, to the scrutiny of trustworthy professional examiners skilled in such matters. Boots, shakos, forage caps, great coats, and knapsacks are in turn passed under review, and found to be objectionable in some important particular or other; while the tight leathern stocks, confining the necks of the soldiers, become, on a march, a punishment as absolute as the wooden stocks for confining the legs of culprits in the olden time.

Among the causes of the sickness and mortality of the Infantry, the Commissioners place want of exercise, and especially of that species of exercise which useful labour supplies; for the guardsman may exclaim, with Antony,—

‘Ten thousand harms, more than the ills I know,
My idleness doth hatch.’

They therefore recommend that every barrack should contain

workshops, and that the men should be employed on different kinds of labour when possible. In short, that the soldier should be treated more like a man and less like a machine. To these recommendations we attach the highest value, both with reference to the health and happiness of the men while they remain in the army, and to their welfare and the benefit of the community to which they are restored when their term of military service has expired, and when the discharged engineer or sapper beats all competitors from the other ranks of the army in the general labour market of the country.

The Royal Engineers, better known by their former appellation of Sappers and Miners, have in each week for drill only one day which is broken in upon by three or four hours' work, and one half day; the rest of their time is given to work, yet they are not inferior to any ordinary regiment in marching or manœuvring. So far from it, that very recently the Commander-in-chief of the army, in presence of the whole garrison of Chatham, after a brigade field-day, strongly repeated, that he never saw a regiment of infantry move better than the Engineers. And as might be expected, the returns of mortality among the troops at home prove that the mortality of the Engineers is with one exception (the Household Cavalry, in which the mortality is slightly lower than in the Engineers,) the lowest of all the branches of the British army; that of the Foot Guards being the highest. But it is not only while in the effective ranks of the army that the mortality of the Foot Guards is found so much to exceed that of the other troops: the same excess is observed after their removal to the pension list. It appears from the returns, that the aggregate mortality of pensioners who had served within the tropics, is even less than among those who have never been exposed to that description of service; and that the excess of mortality in the latter arises from the great mortality among the pensioners from the Foot Guards, which exceeds by one-third that of the general mass who have not been exposed to service within the tropics; and, so far as can be ascertained, this is mainly owing to the prevalence of consumption; which is so common and so fatal among these soldiers during their term of service.

There is nothing, therefore, to prevent a man, whose time is mainly occupied by industrial pursuits, from being a good soldier as well as a good artisan; and the facility with which pensioners from the Sappers and Miners find employment in civil life, the high wages which they earn, and the position which they take among the working classes, present a striking contrast to the utter helplessness of the mere old soldier, who, on his discharge, after twenty-one years' service, if his pension

suffices to maintain him, too frequently returns to civil life a useless member of society, at the age of forty ; or, if his pension is insufficient to maintain himself and his family, falls into the lowest rank of unskilled labourers. The statistical report on the sickness, mortality, and invaliding among troops in the United Kingdom gives many interesting particulars respecting the condition of the pensioned soldiers, which, but for their appearing in the unattractive form of a statistical report, would have received more general attention. It seems that at the date of the report (1853) 19,994 of these men were receiving pensions varying from fivepence to ninepence a day—a class which, being only capable of unskilled labour, have often the greatest difficulty in obtaining employment at the lowest rate of wages ; while, in seasons of distress, they are always the first to be thrown out of work, the employers providing in the first instance for those indigent people who, having no pensions, would otherwise become chargeable to the poor's rate. Except therefore in spring and harvest, or when there is an extraordinary demand for unskilled labour in the manufacturing districts, these old soldiers are restricted to their pensions, which are totally inadequate to their own subsistence, much less to that of a family. If they apply to the union for relief, any allowance to them is deducted from the first issue of pension ; and this is the case also if they are received into the workhouse, while no allowance is made for the labour on which they may have been employed there. On leaving the workhouse, they consequently find themselves worse off than when they entered it, as their pension for the next quarter has been anticipated, and they have nothing but their unskilled labour to depend upon. That their difficulty in finding employment is not attributable to their own misconduct, is shown by the comparative rarity of any serious complaint against them since they have been under military superintendence, and by the fact that a very inconsiderable fraction of the whole number is reported by the staff officers as of bad or indifferent character, chiefly arising from intemperance. The large families of these men, many of them born in the army, and consequently, like their parents, trained to no industrial pursuits, forms another of the serious disadvantages they have to contend with.

Colonel Jebb declares that a great proportion of the repairs of the barracks might be done by military artificers, if carpenters' and other workshops were attached to the barracks ; for when a man was once fully drilled, he might go out with his regiment once or twice a week, and at other times be usefully employed as a carpenter or smith. The soldier should, of course, learn

every thing that could be useful to him on active service in the field; and the skill and knowledge so acquired would greatly facilitate his gaining a respectable social position, and an independent livelihood in civil life when discharged from the army. Several distinguished officers recommend that all soldiers should be taught to bake bread and to cook; though General Lawrence naively remarks of this latter accomplishment, that under the present system — which we hope is doomed to early extinction — ‘there is very little scope for talent; for there is only one dish to cook all the year round.’

The ‘Field Officer,’ the title of whose pamphlet, dated from Aldershot, is prefixed to this article, was forcibly struck by the almost exclusive employment of civil labour at the camp there. His short pamphlet is the production of a thoughtful man and zealous officer, of great and varied experience, who from personal observation accurately appreciates the disadvantages of the soldier’s present position. He strongly recommends the employment of military labour, with a view to elevate the character and improve the position of the soldier; declaring that if the field of employment which the requirements of the army afford were opened to our soldiers, it might be converted into a valuable adjunct to our regimental system. And it was proved in evidence before the Commissioners, that the European troops of the Indian army are allowed to follow industrial pursuits (as tailors, shoemakers, farriers, carpenters, bookbinders, and watchmakers), to their own improvement, both in conduct and in health, and without detriment to them as soldiers.

Again, active service before the enemy may demand of the soldier the performance of duties analogous to those of the skilful railway excavator — an employment requiring great physical strength and much energy, coupled with the intelligence to apply these qualities to the best advantage. The skill to do well this, or indeed any kind of out-of-door work, is of course not to be acquired in barracks, situated in the metropolis or in any other large town. But the railway system, by annihilating the obstacles of space and time, has given us, on any extraordinary emergency, the means of transporting troops instantaneously to any given point from any reasonable distance; and the establishment of an efficient police, not only in the metropolis, but also in the provinces, has made ample provision for securing the public peace under all ordinary circumstances. Since the establishment of the Metropolitan police in 1829, the soldiery have never been brought into conflict with a London mob. In fact, the progress of civilization, of which we have traced the advantages in some other particulars of our social

system, has substituted the active intelligent constable, with his truncheon and his handcuffs, always on the alert within the limits of his beat, for the grim sentry, stationary on his post, with his musket loaded with ball cartridge. In the metropolis we have now a well-organized police force of upwards of 6600 men in the prime of life; and in the provinces a county and borough police force amounting to nearly 11,000. There seems then to be no sufficient reason why the great bulk of the troops at home should not be quartered in the country, where there would be adequate means of finding them suitable employment, and only a small proportion in towns, where, by frequent reliefs, none would remain for any lengthened period. There seems also to be no sufficient reason why a population drawn from the ranks of agricultural labourers in the country, and of journeymen in towns should not, when collected in a barrack, whether in town or country, minister, as artificers of every kind, to their own wants, in the same way as the members of any other section of the community. There are always among the troops some artificers; and others might be incorporated into each regiment from the Engineers, so as to have a certain proportion, for instance a company, of skilled artificers in every regiment, by whom the knowledge and practice of useful industry might be introduced and maintained among the whole body. They might then make their own bricks, build and keep in repair their own barracks, form their own parade-ground, and the roads about their barracks, make and maintain the drainage and watercourses, and when practicable, enclose their premises by entrenchments, that they might become familiar with the advantages of well laid out parapets, and with all the auxiliaries of defence. It is a remarkable deficiency in almost all English military instruction that it is confined to the attack.

We have considered the condition of the soldier when in the army, as bearing upon his future prospects when he shall be returned upon the civil population, from which he was taken, at the greater length, because this subject, though of the utmost importance, was not touched upon by the Commissioners in their Report, it being beyond the limits to which their inquiries were restricted. It only remains for us to express our sense of the calm temper and judicial tone which characterise the Report throughout, and our earnest hope that the necessary reforms which the Commissioners recommend will forthwith be applied to ensure the bodily health and comfort of the soldier, and to emancipate his mind from the degrading thralldom of idleness.

Upon the presentation of the Commissioners' Report, with a view to give effect to the recommendations contained in it,



four separate sub-commissions were issued, the respective members of which were, 1. To inspect every barrack and hospital, and to devise and execute the necessary works with such expedition as the available resources of the country may permit, until every barrack and hospital shall have been brought into a healthy and satisfactory condition; 2. To draw up a scheme for re-organizing the office of Director-general of the Medical Department, and for regulating the promotions and revising the regulations of the department; 3. To draw up a scheme for the proposed Military Medical School; and 4. To arrange the basis and forms on which the statistics of disease and mortality in the army are henceforth to be collected and recorded; for the vital statistics of the army should be so kept as to enable the Government to compare the rates of sickness and death in the army with those of civil life, and with its own rates at previous periods, to judge of the comparative healthiness of every station and every barrack, to trace sickness and mortality to their various causes, to ascertain the comparative influence of each, and to take the precautions and apply the remedies which the case may require. The reports from the medical officers should tell the commander of the forces in the field not only what is the past and existing state of sickness and mortality in his army; but what are the causes of them; and for what time, at a continuance of the same rate, and with what reinforcements, he can maintain his army in the field — of these four sub-commissions the public are now eagerly looking for the fruits.

The cordial unanimity with which the House of Commons ratified the Report of the Commissioners, by passing the resolutions moved on the 11th of May by Lord Ebrington, leaves us no cause for fear that any unreasonable delay or unexpected obstacle will be allowed to retard the reforms proposed by the Commissioners for the removal of existing abuses; while their recommendations (which we have described) for placing the soldier under effective sanitary surveillance, as regards every particular by which his health or his life may be endangered, excepting the fire of the enemy, in whatever circumstances he may be placed, — whether in camp, in barrack, or in hospital, — will provide adequate security for the future. The department constitutionally responsible for the vigilant control of the Estimates will, in carrying into effect the unanimous decision of that branch of the Legislature which holds the purse-strings of the nation, be bound to take due care that the soldier's health shall not henceforth be sacrificed either to a short-sighted and narrow-minded parsimony, or to a wasteful expenditure of the public money on the ill-considered schemes of projectors.

ART. VI.—1. *Kelten und Germanen, eine historische Untersuchung.* Von ADOLF HOLTZMANN. Stuttgart: 1855. One vol. 8vo.

2. *Das ethnographische Verhältniss der Kelten und Germanen, nach den Ansichten der Alten und den sprachlichen Ueberresten dargestellt von* Dr. H. B. C. BRADES. Leipzig: 1857. One vol. 8vo.

IN attempting to reproduce a distinct and precise impression of the social and intellectual life of the ancient Greeks and Romans, it is necessary to keep steadily in view the narrowness of their geographical horizon, and the slow rate at which it was enlarged by commerce, conquest, and scientific discovery. At the time of Herodotus, the Greeks had, in Asia, become acquainted with a considerable part of the Persian empire; and, in Africa, the Nile had carried them into the interior of Egypt: but to the west and north their knowledge did not reach much beyond the shores of the Mediterranean. With the chief part of Europe, the Greeks of that period were wholly unacquainted: they had never sailed beyond the Straits of Gibraltar: the western shores of Spain and France, Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia, were as unknown to them as America or Australia.

The great hero, Hercules, who was conceived in the light of a civiliser and benefactor of mankind; as destroying wild beasts, as punishing tyrants, as opening roads over impassable regions, was believed to have made the Straits of Gibraltar the term of his expedition to the far west, and to have there erected two columns, as memorials of his extreme course. These pillars, beyond which, according to Pindar, every thing was inaccessible and unknown, were converted, by the rationalising tendencies of the later Greeks, into natural objects; into rocks, promontories, or islands. The early Greeks, however, understood the Pillars of Hercules in a literal sense, as they are represented on the pillar dollars of old and new Spain. The same hero was supposed to have erected similar columns on the shores of the Pontus; and thus Euripides speaks of the Black Sea and Mount Atlas, as the proverbial extremities of the known world to the east and west. Even the cautious and sceptical Aristotle believed that the sea beyond the Pillars of Hercules was unfit for navigation. Practically, the ancients regarded the Mediterranean as a lake, and their navigation would not have been perceptibly affected if its western, like its eastern, extremity had been closed by an isthmus.

The voyage of the Argonauts is purely fabulous, and no inferences can be drawn from it respecting the history of commerce or geographical discovery; but it is certain that the Greeks of Asia Minor had, at an early period, sailed into the Black Sea, and Hellenic colonies had begun to be planted on its coasts so early as the seventh century before Christ. The Cimmerian Bosphorus and the Palus Maotis are mentioned by *Æschylus*; and an epigram, attributed to *Simonides*, alludes to the distant Tanais. *Herodotus* was well acquainted with this river (the Don), which he describes as flowing into the Lake Maotis, and as dividing Europe from Asia. But the Caspian Sea lay beyond the range of the distinct vision of the Greeks. *Artemidorus*, of Ephesus, a geographer who lived about 100 B.C., declared that the country east of the Tanais was unexplored. Even after the expedition of Alexander, the Caspian was believed to be a gulf of the Northern Ocean, with which it communicated by a long narrow chauncel. The Greeks were ignorant of the Volga: this river first occurs under the name of the Rha, in the writings of geographers and historians who lived under the Roman empire. *Pliny*, indeed, informs us that, with regard to the Palus Maotis, his contemporaries believed it to be connected with the Great Northern Sea. Some thought that it was a gulf of the ocean, while others held it to be a lagoon, separated from the sea by a narrow strip of land. So imperfectly acquainted were the Greeks with the geography of the lands to the north of their own country, that in the reign of Philip the Fifth, of Macedon (181 B.C.), it was generally believed that the Black Sea and the Adriatic, the Danube and the Alps, could be seen simultaneously from the top of *Hæmus*.*

Herodotus is ignorant of the Alps as a chain of mountains: he calls the Alps a river flowing northwards from Upper Italy, and falling into the Danube; he likewise describes *Pyrene* as a town near the sources of the Danube. It was, he says, unknown, in his time, whether Europe was bounded by sea on the west; he expressly states that he had been unable to ascertain this fact from the testimony of any eyewitness, notwithstanding his endeavours to obtain information on the subject. *Polybius*, the consistent enemy of exaggeration and imposture, declares that, in his time (about 150 B.C.), nothing was known of the northern parts of Europe, lying between *Narbo*, in Gaul, to the west, and the river Tanais, to the east. The prevailing belief of that period was that the

* See *Livy*, xl. 21, *Mela*, ii. 2.

ocean stretched across the north of Europe, from the neighbourhood of the Caspian and the Sea of Azoff, to the Straits of Gibraltar. That the belief in a circumfluous ocean, connecting the northern shores of India with Germany, continued to hold its ground for some time longer, appears from a curious anecdote preserved by Pliny and Mela. Q. Metellus Celer, when pro-consul of Cisalpine Gaul, in 62 B.C., received as a present from the king of the Suevi, some Indians, who were said to have sailed from India for purposes of trade, and to have been carried by contrary winds to Germany. The Suevi dwelt on the eastern bank of the Rhine; and their donation must have been sent to Metellus across the Alps.

The name of Britain seems to have been first made known to the Greeks by Pytheas, a Massilian navigator, who lived at or soon after the time of Alexander the Great. Pytheas published an account of a voyage which he declared himself to have made along the north-western coasts of Europe. He stated that he had visited Britain, and traversed the whole of it by land; he likewise gave an account of a marvellous island named Thule, situated six days' sail to the north of Britain, near the frozen sea; he did not profess to have reached this island; he stated, however, that it was composed of a substance which was neither earth, air, nor water, but was something compounded of all three, and resembled the *pulmo marinus*, a mollusca found in the Mediterranean. Of this substance, he asserted that he had seen a specimen. He likewise gave an account of amber being found in a northern island, opposite a shore of the ocean inhabited by the Guttones. He added that, on his return, he had sailed along the whole coast of northern Europe, between Gadeira and the Tanais.

The criticisms of Polybius and Strabo prove conclusively that Pytheas was to a great extent an impostor, and that the account of his voyage to these remote regions is entitled to little or no credit. The name and existence of Thule were equally the invention of Pytheas; they represented nothing real, although attempts were made in later times to invest Thule with a geographical character; and his statement that he had coasted along the north of Europe from the river Don to Cadiz, shows that his accounts rested not on fact, but on the fanciful errors received in his own day. It cannot be considered as certain that he even sailed as far as Britain. Gosselin, indeed, after a careful analysis of the supposed facts reported by Pytheas, comes to the conclusion that he never visited that island, but that he collected either at Gades, or at some other port frequented by the Carthaginians, some vague notions on the

northern seas and regions of Europe, and that he passed them off upon his countrymen for his own discoveries.*

Herodotus declares that he has no knowledge of the northern river Eridanus, or of the Cassiterid Islands, from which amber and tin were imported into Greece. He believes, nevertheless, that the two articles in question came from the extremities of the earth. These extremities of the earth were, doubtless, the southern shore of the Baltic and Cornwall; from which places the Greeks were supplied with these commodities, through the agency of some intermediate trade. Timæus, the historian, who wrote about 250 B.C., stated that tin was brought from an island within six days' sail of Britain; Polybius knew that tin was produced in the Britannic Islands; and Posidonius, about fifty years after him, stated that it was transported from those islands to Massilia. The most probable supposition is, that Greece and Italy were exclusively supplied with amber by an overland trade, across Central Europe, from the shores of the Baltic to the head of the Adriatic; and that the Britannic tin was for the most part carried across Gaul to Massilia.

Before about the year 700 B.C., the entire carrying trade of the Mediterranean seems to have been in the hands of the Tyrians; and they had, at periods antecedent to authentic history, established colonies at Carthage, Utica, and Gades. The northern coast of Africa was, to a great extent, Phœnician; the coasting voyage from the Nile to the Pillars of Hercules (which Scylax reckons at seventy-four days), could therefore be safely performed by a Tyrian merchant vessel. In this manner Tyre was able to carry on a regular trade with Gades and the wealthy Tartessus, the favoured region upon the Bætis; but neither the Phœnicians nor the Carthaginians appear to have advanced their permanent settlements far to the west of Gades; and if their trade to the north did not extend further than their trade to the south, along the western shore of Africa, so far was it from reaching the amber coast of the Baltic, or the tin mines of Cornwall, that it could scarcely have ascended as high as the mouth of the Tagus. The traces of Phœnician establish-

* *Recherches sur la Géographie des Anciens* (Paris, 1813), vol. iv. p. 178. References to the numerous writings respecting Pytheas and his supposed discoveries will be found in Fuhr, *De Pytheâ Massiliensi Dissertatio*, Darmstadt, 1835; who likewise presents his readers with an engraving of the *pulmo marinus*. Bayle (*Dict. art. Pytheas*) says of him, 'Il abusea étrangement de la maxime, *A beau mentir qui vient de loin*; car il n'y eut sorte de fables qu'il ne racontât des 'pays septentrionaux, qu'il se vantoit d'avoir vus.'

ments on the southern coast of Spain have been carefully collected and investigated by Movers, in his learned work on the Phœnicians: they extend along the whole of the ancient Bætica, from Murgis to the river Anas or Guadiana: but although Ulysippo, the modern Lisbon, fabled to be the foundation of Ulysses, is conjectured by Movers, on etymological grounds, to have been a Phœnician name, there is no clear historical record of the existence of any Phœnician factory on the western or Lusitanian face of the peninsula.

The enterprise of the Carthaginians, in the way both of colonisation and discovery, seems to have been directed rather along the African than along the European shore of the Atlantic. There were many Carthaginian settlements on the western coast of Africa, beginning with Tingis, the modern Tangier: and the Punic mariners had, probably before 300 B.C., become acquainted with some of the Canary Islands. It may, however, be confidently asserted, that the views of those who, like Heeren, maintain that the Carthaginians sailed to the Prussian coast for amber, and even hint at their having reached America, are opposed both to evidence and probability.

By the expedition of Cæsar the Romans were made acquainted with the northern shores of Gaul, and with Britain, situated at the extremity of the world.* It was Cæsar's boast that he had been not only the invader, but the discoverer, of this remote island.† The German ocean was first navigated by Drusus, in 12 B.C.; and in A.D. 1, Tiberius sent a flotilla down the Rhine, with orders to follow the coast eastwards and to sail up the mouth of the Elbe, an operation which was accomplished with success. These waters were, however, considered so distant from the Roman world, that Pseudo-Albinovanus, a contemporary poet, could represent one of the companions of Drusus as describing the terrors of the voyage in the following terms:—

‘Quo ferimur? ruit ipse dies, orbemque relictum
Ultima perpetuis claudit natura tenebris.
Anne alio positas ultra sub carline gentes,
Atque alium libris intactum quærimus orbem?
Di revocant, rerumque vetant cognoscere finem
Mortales oculos.’

But although Roman discovery at this period advanced as far as the Elbe, it advanced no farther. ‘Every thing,’ says

* Virgil (*Æn.* viii. 727.) speaks of ‘*extremi hominum Morini*.’ The Morini inhabited Northern Gaul, the country where Calais and Boulogne now stand.

Strabo, 'beyond the Elbe is unknown;' 'and,' he adds, in the belief of a continuous northern sea, 'no one has navigated along 'the coast as far as the mouths of the Caspian.' At the time of this geographer, however, the Romans had heard of the peninsula of Jutland, which they called the Cimbric Chersonese; and by the time of Pliny they had become acquainted with the Vistula. We learn, indeed, from the same writer, that, during the reign of Nero, a Roman knight was employed to buy amber in the north of Germany; that he reached the northern coast — which must have been the southern coast of the Baltic — by way of Carnuntum, a town on the Danube between the modern Vienna and Præsburg, and that he returned to Rome with a large supply of the article which he was commissioned to purchase.

At this period the Romans likewise heard of the existence of the Scandinavian peninsula; but they conceived it to be a collection of large islands, and not a peninsula; so that by this hypothesis (which seems to have retained its currency for a long time, since even Jordanes, who lived in the sixth century, mentions the island of Scanzia) they were able to reconcile the existence of land in this direction with an open sea reaching to the north of the Caspian.

In this imperfect state of geographical knowledge respecting Central and Northern Europe, it is not likely that the Greeks should have possessed any distinct ideas respecting the population of the countries beyond the Danube and the Alps. The news of the capture of Rome by the Gauls in the year 390 B.C., reached Athens in the form of a story that an army of Hyperboreans had taken a Hellenic city named Rome, situated near the *Great Sea*. All that Herodotus seems to know of the Celts is, that they dwell near the sources of the Danube, that their country is beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and that they lie furthest to the west, with the exception of the Cynetes. Strabo states that Timosthenes and Eratosthenes, both writers on geography about 280—200 B.C., and their predecessors, were without positive information respecting Iberia and Celtica, and still more concerning Germany and Britain. Indeed (he adds) their knowledge of Italy, the Adriatic, the Black Sea, and the regions immediately to the north, was extremely imperfect. The prevailing opinion among the Greeks, until the campaigns of Cæsar had opened Central Europe, was, that the whole region west of Scythia was inhabited by a Celtic population; and it was comprised under the general appellation of Celtica.

The vague and fluctuating language of the ancients respecting

the ethnographical relations of Central and Northern Europe, has induced Dr. Holtzmann to question the received opinion as to the Gauls, Germans, and Britons, and to propound, in the treatise named at the head of this article, the theory which we now proceed to state.

The two propositions which he seeks to establish, are — 1, that the Germans are Celts; 2, that the Kymri and the Gaels are not Celts. And he denies the truth of the received propositions — 1, that the Germans are not Celts; 2, that the Kymri and the Gaels are Celts. He shows that the writers who treated this subject after the revival of letters, maintained the national identity of the ancient Celts and Germans, and that the now received opinion was first promulgated by Dom Bouquet in 1738. It was adopted by many writers in the last century, but its universal acceptance was (according to Dr. Holtzmann) owing to the passions excited by the wars of the French Revolution and Empire. At that period of mutual aversion, both parties were glad to affirm that Germans and Gauls had always been distinct nations. The finely organised Gallic nation (it was said by the French) had nothing in common with the rough northern barbarians, who first under Ariovistus, afterwards under the Vandal king, Crocus, Chlodio the Frank and others, and, lastly, under Blücher, had devastated the plains of France. On the other hand, the Germans appealed to the description of the people in the ‘Germania’ of Tacitus, and dwelt on the passages of the ancients which spoke of the instability, the frivolity, and the vices of the Gauls. Hence both nations, Dr. Holtzmann thinks, rejoiced in repudiating all community of language and affinity of blood, and gladly adopted the historical theory which coincided with their feelings of animosity. With regard to the Gaels and the Welsh, their national vanity was gratified by a system which represented them as the primitive people of Western Europe, and found in their language etymologies of ancient Gallic words. Dr. Holtzmann considers it as certain that the British races (under which name he includes the Kymri of Wales and Brittany, and the Gaels of Ireland and Scotland) and the Germans are of different national origins. Hence, as he truly says, it follows that if the Germans are Celts, the British races are not Celts.

Dr. Holtzmann begins by laying it down that all Central Europe was inhabited by Celtic tribes, such as the Cimabri and the Teutones, who are expressly called Celts by the ancient writers; and that the belief in large immigrations of Germans from Scandinavia is groundless. He maintains that Scandinavia

was a barren and nearly uninhabited country, and that its reputation of being a cradle of nations is fabulous. Hence he draws the conclusion that if Central Europe was occupied by Celtic tribes, and Scandinavia was nearly uninhabited, no space is left where the Germans could have resided. He next proceeds to collect the testimonies of the ancients, which support the identity of the Germans and the Celts; but these, when correctly interpreted, are in fact mere adoptions and repetitions of the old vague phraseology by which all Central Europe west of Scythia was assigned to the Celts and was called Celtica. With regard to the Britons, he shows that their affinity with the Gauls is first affirmed by Tacitus in the 'Agricola'; but his attempt to weaken this testimony is not successful. He seeks further to support his views by adducing those statements of the ancients by which similar physical characteristics (such as light hair, blue eyes, and height of body) are attributed to both Celts and Germans, and by pointing out the rude and barbarous state of the Britons, as compared with the more civilised manners of the Gauls. The explanation of Tacitus, that 'Britanni nacent, quales Galli fuerunt,' is rejected by him as contrary to probability.

The passages respecting the resemblance of the Gallic and British religions, cause Dr. Holtzmann greater difficulty. The presence of Druids in the island of Mona (Anglesey), when it was invaded by the Romans in 61 A.D., is distinctly attested by Tacitus in the 14th book of the 'Annals'; but this testimony he removes by a conjectural alteration of the text. Having cleared away this obstacle, he denies the existence of Druids in Britain. The positive testimony of Caesar that the Druidical discipline was invented in Britain, and introduced from that country into Gaul, and that those who wish to make themselves perfect masters of the system, generally repair to Britain in order to learn it, is again set aside by substituting *Germania* for *Britannia*. The resort to such extreme measures in support of a historical theory, must be regarded as presumptive evidence that its state is desperate.*

* Mr. C. Merivale, in his recently published volume (vol. vi.) of the 'History of the Romans under the Empire,' devotes a chapter to the reduction of Britain by Claudius, and the subsequent operations of the Roman officers. In connexion with this subject, he mentions the proscription of Druidism in Gaul by this Emperor (Suet. Claud. 25.); he recognises the affinity of the Gallic and British religions, and considers British Druidism to have been extirpated by Suetonius Paullinus, in 61 B.C.

Dr. Holtzmann concludes his proofs by an investigation of the words preserved from the ancient Celtic tongue, which he identifies with words in the Teutonic languages, and not with Gaelic, Welsh, or Breton forms.

The arguments and conclusions of Dr. Holtzmann are examined and confuted by Dr. Brandes, in the essay whose title we have prefixed to this article. We consider the system of the former as unsound.* Whatever may be the inconsistency or obscurity in the language used by the ancients, we cannot but think that Cæsar and Tacitus regarded the Gauls and the Germans as forming distinct races, and that both considered the Britons as allied to their Gallic neighbours. Nevertheless, the boldness of his assertions attracts attention, and he will render an useful service to history if, by putting the advocates of the received opinion upon their defence, he causes the evidence respecting the ethnological relations of the Germans, Gauls, and Britons to be examined more critically than heretofore.

We ought, in conclusion, to remind our readers that the critical investigation of the modern Celtic languages was originated by our countryman, Dr. Prichard, twenty-five years ago, whose treatise on the subject, with the addition of a large store of illustrative notes, has recently been republished under the competent editorship of Dr. Latham.

ART. VII.—1. *Dernières Chansons de 1834 à 1851.* Par P. J. DE BÉRANGER. Avec une lettre et une préface. Paris: 1857.

2. *Ma Biographie.* Ouvrage posthume de P. J. DE BÉRANGER, avec un appendice. Paris: 1858.

3. *Quarante-cinq Lettres de Béranger et détails sur sa Vie.* Publiés par Madame LOUISE COLET. Paris: 1858.

4. *Mémoires de Béranger, Souvenirs, &c.* Par SAVINIEN LA-POINTE. Paris: 1858.

5. *Cours Familier de Littérature. Béranger.* Par M. DE LA-MARTINE: 1857.

6. *Béranger, et ses Dernières Chansons.* Par M. EMILE MONTÉGUT. (*Revue des Deux Mondes.*) 1858.

7. *Béranger et ses Chansons.* Par JOSEPH BERNARD. Paris.

THIRTY-SIX years have elapsed since the author of 'Le Roi d'Yvetot' was installed in a place among the poets of Europe; and as he himself, in his autobiography, has commemorated the fact, we may justifiably repeat that the title of enrolment was first made out by the 'Edinburgh Review.' It is a quarter of a century since we took leave of him,—on his taking leave of public life, by the publication of his 'Last Songs,' in 1833. Literature and manners have hardly ever run through more rapid and strongly-marked changes, in one country, than those which have marked the social and intellectual life of France, during the same period. Hardly ever has a brilliancy so specious as some of the phases of change possessed, faded so suddenly away into that which resembles annihilation rather than pause. But throughout the whole series of cameleon metamorphoses,—surviving the decay of many things fondly in their hour presumed to be progressive and imperishable,—a voice, a name, a poet, and a verse have lived on—grown, not decayed, in the midst of all the confusions around them,—and retaining, perhaps for all time, a lustre which many greater things have lost for ever. We can recall in art only one instance parallel to the position which Béranger has held during this quarter of a century,—the steadfast curiosity and interest which during five and twenty years have attached themselves to the perversely mute Signor Rossini. But the parallel holds good only in part; the composer of 'Guillaume Tell' vanished behind the curtain while yet he was a young man; the singer of 'Roger Bontemps' had reached maturity ere he withdrew.

The musician had enriched the stores of Opera by many large and important works; the *chansonnier's* claim to remembrance is confined within a single pocket volume of lyrics; some of which being prompted by the suffering or sarcasm of the moment, might fairly be deemed altogether ephemeral.

If Béranger was solicitously watched and singularly flattered during his silent life, he has not been forgotten on his death. The volumes enumerated at the head of this article, which have been published in rapid succession since his death, indicate, by their diversity of parentage and character as much as by their number, the depth and width of interest belonging to their subject. Some months, however, have now elapsed since the last of them appeared; so that for the present we may assume the revelation to be complete,—the book of anecdote closed; and out of the memorials before us we proceed to trace an outline of the character of the Poet.

In order to do this, it may be as well briefly to describe the nature of these materials. — The body of the Poet, buried ere it was well cold, with the peremptory glories of a state funeral, had been laid in its grave only a few days, when an enthusiastic second-hand *Corinne* rushed (as it were) into the cemetery to fling a tawdry wreath of stage amaranths on the songster's simple tomb—telling the world that she had a right to be the chief-mourner among chief-mourners; that she was the woman who had best appreciated the poet, — ‘the muse’ whom he had the most admired,—the spoiled child of genius, whom he had most delighted to spoil. Thus—to fit theatrical phrase to theatrical things—may be described the tribute paid to Béranger by Madame Louise Colet, the southern poetess; yet, in spite of all the tawdriness and conceit of her little book, there is a touch of sincerity in its grief and its homage; and among the anecdotes and fragments of correspondence may be found a trait or two to which we have been indebted.

Next, and not long after Madame Colet, arrived at Béranger's tomb another mourner, more substantial and sadder, with more to tell, and a better right to speak—M. Savinien Lapointe. No common cause has M. Lapointe to conceive the spot where Béranger lies hallowed ground. The *chansonnier* kept to the last hour of his life a very warm corner of his heart for poets of the people. He thought for them, he fought for them; he helped them against their own weakness—whether it took the form of vanity or melancholy. He did his best to direct their studies, to advance their fortunes, to obtain for their attempts a fair hearing. There are few things more pure, more abiding, more deep, than the affection which considerate

notice such as his is calculated to engender in those who have worth or merit. The shoemaker-poet whom Béranger sought out at an early period of his career, whom he delicately assisted, discreetly counselled, and admitted to his confidence,—whose services he accepted at that time of sickness, when a man can only bear *real* ministry,—may be forgiven for some exaggeration, for some want of delicacy, for some assumption. M. Lapointe is, doubtless, too gratefully garrulous regarding the active, but delicately secret charities of his idol: ‘One should be modest,’ said Charles Lamb, ‘for a modest man.’ He is too positive again, in speculating on those opinions and convictions which every sincere man keeps locked within his bosom. The extent to which Béranger was orthodox or heterodox in his creed, was not to be measured by his disciple. Over-confidence, some coarseness, and not a little indiscretion, mark M. Lapointe’s book; yet it contains many interesting anecdotes, and a few to which no future biographer can avoid referring.

The enthusiastic panegyric of M. de Lamartine is, again, in quality, entirely different from those of Madame Colet or M. Lapointe. The sonorous and poetical egotism of the author of ‘Jocelyn’ and ‘Genéviève’ flows through its periods. The appreciation is not without a certain tone and flavour of equality,—nay more, of condescension. ‘Kindred minds mingle,’ said Sir Charles Grandison to some new acquaintance, whom he desired to encourage. Courtly, rhapsodical, chivalrous, cherishing the bounteous sympathies of a *grand seigneur* belonging to the court of genius, M. de Lamartine sweeps round the simple grave of the *chansonnier*—with the air of one who fancies he leads a procession and a dirge; paints his deceased friend, faithfully it may be, but from a palette of florid colours—places him on a conspicuous pedestal, but decorates him with an Arcadian profusion of inscription, urn, and garland. Lest we be thought to have forced a description for the purposes of effect, let us attempt to present, in free paraphrase, the portrait of one poet taken by another:—

‘Who was the man,’ says M. de Lamartine, speaking of the poet’s strange and sudden funeral, ‘so immense that an entire nation became too small to follow and to do honour to his burial procession? Something like this. A little old man, without distinction at the first sight, unless one could penetrate his countenance with the divining glance of genius;—so much of simplicity was there, with all its subtlety. He wore the dress of a rustic Alcinous, beneath which it was next to impossible to suspect his divinity in the midst of a crowd; shoes tied with a thong,—and with thick soles, of which I loved the heavy sound (ah me! I shall hear it no more on the steps of my

stairs); coarse silk stockings, blue or grey, often splashed betwixt shoes and trowsers, the latter turned up to keep them out of the dust of the street; a clean cotton waistcoat, but a common one, rather open above his large chest, showing a shirt of linen, milk white but coarse, such as country wives spin from their own hemp for the village wearer;—a wrapper of greyish cloth, the elbows of which showed the cord, while the unequal skirts let his legs be seen, as he went along the road;—and lastly, a wide-brimmed beaver, also grey, with no form or worse than none, sometimes stuck across his head, sometimes heavily thrust forward on his brow, which gave play to some locks unkempt, but still fair, that fell about his face, or on his coat collar, completed his dress. He used to go about with a white wood stick, without head or ferule, not an old man's stick,—'twas a habit his hand had; he rarely leaned on it, but, with the end of this holly branch, would trace capricious figures on the floor, on the pavement, or on the sand. . . . As to his features, they might have been made out with big strokes of the thumb in clay, as in the rude but faithful little statue of him which the young sculptor, Adam Salomon, has moulded.—There is the forehead large and beetling, the blue protruding eyes, the coarse arched nose, the cheeks in strong relief, the thick lips, the chin with a dimple in it, the visage more round than oval, the short but muscular neck, well set on the massive shoulders, the square-cut figure, the short legs, the frame apparently heavy, in reality supple (so strong was the spring, physical and moral, within it). But, then, that forehead was so thoughtful, those eyes were at once so transparent and so penetrating, those nostrils breathed such enthusiasm,—those cheeks were so modelled and their hollows furrowed by incessant thought and feeling, that mouth was so fine and loving, that smile was so kindly, those lips on which irony and tenderness met, that chin so marked, were so sarcastic.—The shadows which fell from his hair . . . the sound itself of his words—sometimes grave and tremulous (as *Time* is), sometimes serene and impassive (as is *Eternity*), sometimes plaintive, broken as the tone of age, sometimes playful, and with the mixed sound of the light evening breeze, which touches, trifling, the careless chords of the soul—and all these traits,—all these expressions,—all these different intonations, had in them so much of charm, that one felt enthralled, fascinated, raptured in contemplation by that face. One said within one's-self, that which Alcibiades said of Socrates after he had heard the sage speak of things human and divine: "Something divine, while we knew it not, must have diffused itself over that countenance. Ugly as the man is, he is still the most beautiful of mortals."

Here, allowing for a romancer's tinting, dimly represented by an attempt to reproduce it in the lights and shades of another language, is a lively picture of Béranger's outer man. We have already hinted the rock on which M. de Lamartine may have split, in his essay to characterise the genius of one so different in ambition and in conversation from himself. The author who has always desired to achieve greatness, could hardly, by dra-

matic possibility, fairly appreciate the other, who was determined on principle not to have greatness thrust upon him. The epic poet perpetually fanning the flame of enthusiasm, could hardly appreciate the songster, to whose guidance the tiny, clear taper of common sense sufficed, let the path be ever so entangled, — let the fairy voices through the mist be ever so seductive. But the attempt of M. de Lamartine to judge and to attach himself to a man like Béranger, bears within itself no mean testimony to the warmth of the one poet, and to the value of the other.

These reminiscences or memorials of the Poet are more or less biographical. Next in order we come to the elaborate and skilful dissection of the genius of Béranger by M. Montégut. This, with all its skill and elaboration, seems to us in some degree to rank among the exercises of ‘perverse industry,’ — to borrow one of Moore’s graphic phrases. The predetermined spirit of depreciation in which the task has been entered on is ill concealed by an academical balance of periods — by a show of logic in the reasonings — and by concessions, which amount to little more than what all the thinking and feeling world had agreed to grant as a matter of course. There is a super-exquisite justice, as well as a super-refined caution: both belong to infallibility, neither to humanity. To these contemporary or posthumous criticisms of the character and writings of Béranger, one remains to be added, which bears the stamp of a more penetrating and comprehensive intellect. The single page which M. Guizot has devoted to this poet of the people, in the first volume of his own historical Memoirs, is, in our judgment, the most correct estimate of Béranger’s powers, and one of the most remarkable tributes to his eminence.

‘At the same period, a man of the people, born a poet, but grown yet more a poet by art, sang, delighted, kindled, and propagated by his songs the popular instincts and passions against every thing that recalled the former monarchy of France, and especially against the claims and the domination of the clergy. Béranger was not, at bottom, a revolutionist or a blasphemer, he was better and wiser than his songs; but he was a democrat by conviction as well as by taste, and rendered, by this democratic spirit, more prone to licence and to want of foresight, he assailed at hazard whatever the people disliked, caring nothing for the range of his fire, taking the success of his songs for a victory of France, loving the Revolution and the Empire far more than liberty, and forgetting, with common levity, that faith and veneration are nowhere more indispensable than in free democratic communities. He found this out, I think, at last, though rather late, when he saw himself in presence of the passions which his songs had fomented, and of the shapes which his dreams had assumed. Upon this he hastened, with characteristic caution, to

withdraw from the arena of politics, and almost from society, not changed in his own sentiments, but somewhat saddened and alarmed by the consequences of the warfare in which he had taken so considerable a part. He was, under the Restoration, full of confidence as well as of enthusiasm, modestly intoxicated with his popularity; and although he exaggerated to himself his own political importance and capacity, he attained a higher amount of serious influence than had ever before fallen to a song-writer.' (*Guizot's Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 283.)

Since Béranger's death, we have been favoured with the songs composed in the last eighteen years of his life, from 1834 to 1851 — with his autobiographical sketches (for the book bequeathed by him to M. Perrotin, his publisher, can hardly claim a more substantial name,) — and with his own notes on his poems. The last come in a double form; since they appear to have been talked by Béranger to M. Bernard, — who has not been slack in bringing them into the market, — as well as put on paper for the benefit of Béranger's legatee and executor. Ere, however, we attempt to follow the poet's own account of the events of his life, let us say, in no disrespect to poetry, but from experience of humanity, that Béranger's autobiographical revelations are like most — shall we not say *all*, — similar documents; — in some measure apologetical. Reasons after the fact must be given by authors when they begin to desecant on their authorship. Let them have been even as well balanced and considerate *before* the fact, as we hold Béranger to have been, — it is certain that a desire to square, to straighten, to reconcile, will creep in, so often as the old man begins to write about the fancies or feelings which decided his young efforts. There must appear a little spark of family pride, a little gleam of conscious virtue, in all persons talking about themselves, who would have their grave watched by love, not circled with that cynical mistrust which forbids flowers to blossom or dew to fall on it.

'Could I have chosen my cradle,' says Béranger, 'it should have been Paris.' In Paris he was born, in the year 1780, in the house of his grandfather Champy, the tailor, immortalized in the lyric of the 'Tailor and the Fairy.' His father, only a grocer's book-keeper, when he was thirty, rashly married one of the tailor's six daughters, a milliner's apprentice. Shortly after this marriage the wife went east and the husband west: and their child, like the egg of the ostrich laid in the sand, was left for any thing or person who chose to cherish him. But then there was a '*de*' in the family. The old tailor was philosophical, read Voltaire and Raynal; his wife, too, was not a

common tailor's wife — but a reader ; and the boy, who loved to sit in a corner, making scissor-cuttings, scratches, or sketches, or carvings on cherry-stones, began life, he says, as a close observer and a sparing talker. He studied, while very young, the 'Henriade,' with notes and commentaries, also a translation of 'Jerusalem' by Mirabaud — and, in short, though he was flung out into the kennel as a creature for whom any kind soul had leave to care, he still cannot be said to have begun life as the children of mean or low-thoughted people usually do. Poverty there was, possibly idleness and waywardness, on the part of the boy, destined in after days to become so remarkable for common sense ; — but not that blank, cruel, pinching, ignorant misery, which weighs on the brain of the infant, like the torturing cap of certain savage nations, and from under which only a regulated and recognised idiocy can proceed. Later, when the grandfather-tailor, smitten with palsy, could no longer charge himself to care for the youth with the 'de' to his name, so utterly left and laid aside by his parents, kind Fortune committed the little Béranger to his aunt Bouvet, at Péronne, a good, affectionate, honest tavern-keeper, a woman as superior in intellect as in heart. She helped the un-mothered boy (he says) to think and to learn ; and to her he seems naturally throughout life to have turned, as to the first woman who really influenced the course of a life, which otherwise might have been erratic, blundering, and for every intellectual purpose and feat, wasted. Possibly in all these recollections Béranger's grateful memory may have coloured the facts. Yet that cannot have been a woman either poor or false in nature, who devised her own epitaph after this wise :—'A wife who had no children, 'yet whom many children regretted.' Few tombstone tributes are better or more honest than this.

The thunder-storm, which did not kill Béranger (curiously coincident, in the manner of his telling it with the catastrophe of the beam falling on the head of Grétry, which assured him that since he was to live, it must be to become a great musician) — the readings of classical authors at the instance of this superior aunt Bouvet ; — the boy's attempt to speak at the club at Péronne, which was a sort of ultra-liberal club, as times were ; — his apprenticeship to Laisnez, the printer and publisher, all contribute to the picture of a young man 'makin' himsel' (as Scott's Border-familiar phrased it), in which there may be less difficulty, less persecution, less inevitable misery, than the old man likes to admit, when he looks back on the young man's life. In any event, Béranger, after a few years of this strange incoherent apprenticeship to thought and culture, — to printing

and tavern life — was summoned back to the metropolis of France, to associate himself with his father, the *M. de Béranger*, who had flung him off. That precious parent, after having so coolly exempted himself from his duties, does not appear to have hesitated, when a question arose in regard to the amount of devotion (a sort of Shylock's bargain) which he thought himself entitled to claim from his son. The elder de Béranger was aware that the younger one had qualities and capacities above the common order, which might be made to contribute to his own determination to rise in the world. The youth, as many men skilled in numbers and music have been, was quick at figures. He showed, moreover, that decision of character, which, supposing it bent in the right direction, makes a valuable staff or support for any undertaking. This strong will the scheming father hoped to regulate. Finding his son willing to assist him in the business of money-jobbing, which he had embraced, it was thought possible by the selfish parent that certain liberal ideas, with which the boy had been indoctrinated at Péronne, might be eradicated. *M. de Béranger* was a royalist, deep in secret service for the party, and busy in conspiracy. Of these petty plots and transactions the son could not avoid being cognizant; he was even, more than once, an accomplice in them; but though his honour might be trusted in action, there was no training him to the prescribed form of acquiescence. He openly avowed to his father his disbelief and disagreement; he would serve him as an assistant, but with a will unbroken and a mind unconvinced; so that the discipline of opposition was not wanting to his education.

During the brief time of his father's opulence, which passed like a phantom, the youth may have had some opportunities of studying the wrecks of the old aristocratic life and society of France. Throughout his whole life he seems to have kept a corner of sympathy for that which was loyal and chivalrous, which short-sighted observers would hardly expect to find in one who flew at game no less august than Kings and Archbishops, and who has been ranged among the sceptics and revolutionists, because his wit helped their work. Chateaubriand, for instance, had a strong influence over his mind at the time when he began to attempt literature, and the two remained steady, personal friends to the last. Béranger began his own authorship by dreaming, not of ballads, — but of epics and tragedies: he attempted solemn constructions of the orthodox and academical fashion, and hammered away at these as hard and as patiently as if he had not been doomed in after life, pertinaciously to reject all acade-

mical distinction with its formalities. This flavour of the old world, nevertheless, gave his songs that distinction, which at an early period set them apart from the ditties of the more ephemeral song writers of the *Caveau*. His pride, which may be traced in every line of his memoirs, was different from the stiff self-assertion of the democrat. On the other hand, the money-lending business brought Béranger into contact with the poor and the working classes of Paris. His grandmother Champy, who assisted 'in the concern,' used to complain that the youth's good heart cheated him—little foreseeing that in these transactions with the distressed and needy, in the confidences and glimpses of life to which they gave occasion, there lay a mine of experiences and humours, and glimpses into the world of mother-wit and unspoiled Nature, without which no poet can be various, nor, in the large sense of the word, popular. The Shakspeares, Molières, Scotts, were not players on one string; because they were not people of one world. A writer like Alfred De Musset (whom M. Montégut has presumed to compare, with an ill-judged preference, to Béranger himself) may profess to try as many different subjects as he pleases. There will be always one tone of colour, one strain of music, one taste or taint of personality throughout his productions; or, if not these, a forced, unreal affectation, which effects nothing,—which reaches no one.

By the time that young Béranger was eighteen, when the downfall of the money-lending business took place,—it is evident that he had gone through a reasonably various course of education; no less clear that he had already made an impression on all around him, as one who possessed a firmness and originality of character beyond his years. He was then so feeble in constitution, that his father (who seems to have had little tenderness for him) used to say, 'Thou hast not long to live; I shall soon have to bury thee.' He was pale, lean, weak-sighted, bald at twenty-three,—looking so prematurely old, as to be exempted from military conscription, because he was thought to have passed the age for service. Yet these were the days when

'Lesto et joyeux je grimpais six étages —
Dans un Grenier qu'on est bien à vingt ans,'

as he afterwards sang. The garret on the Boulevard St. Martin may have been more real (we venture to surmise) than the gaiety. The poet had to face poverty as well as bad health. Every article of value that he had ever owned must needs be pawned. The few clothes left him were in rags. He had, however, already attached to himself some of the friends who followed

him to his grave;—he was already throwing out songs to make the social dinners of himself and his comrades merry, let their fare be ever so homely. How he was aided through these years of strait and struggle, will be adverted to presently. Enough, for the moment, to remember that he did not sink utterly. Great, however, must have been his extremity, since, for the one only time in Béranger's life, it subdued him to the point of asking a favour from a great man, and of seeking a patron in high places—for himself. In the beginning of the year 1804, he sent his two poems, 'The Re-establishment of Worship' and 'The Deluge,' to M. Lucien Bonaparte. That distinguished person saw in what Béranger calls 'those feeble dithyrambs,' more than their writer had put into them. Or it may have been the wording of the appeal that struck him; since the felicity of Béranger as a letter writer was, from first to last, remarkable. M. Lucien Bonaparte answered the poet's appeal, granted an interview to the petitioner, ensured him a small income (a large part of which was handed over to Béranger's thankless father), lectured him on style,—for M. Lucien, too, fancied himself a poet,—recommended to the young man the study of the ancient classics, and invited him to deal with 'The Death of Nero' as a subject which might be treated with good purpose. Rarely did ever rhymester wisely choose his theme for a greater or less rhymester. Béranger got to the length of three hundred lines,—but no further, in his Roman epic. Up to that time, he nevertheless assures us, he had been able to throw off verse with 'frightful facility.' Some change within him was beginning to make him fastidious. Later in life, he declares earnestly (by way of warning and guidance to young poets) his solicitude in selection, in retrenchment, in polish, in the fitting of rhymes, or the balance of cadences, knew no bounds. 'Unlucky,' he says in the lively note to the *chanson* 'Ma Lampe,' addressed to Madame Dufrèsnoy, (where he almost denies the possibility of any woman being a careful and complete artificer,)—'Unlucky is the poet who is no workman! Unlucky the poet who is only a workman!'

The protection of M. Lucien Bonaparte in some measure turned the tide of Béranger's fortunes. He had thenceforward chances of official appointments;—some literary occupation too. The last, though formal, may not have been useless, by tying him down to that exactness of expression which so remarkably distinguished his lyrics. There were still, however, bad periods to be got through from time to time; there were still vicissitudes to be encountered, and in

one of these a friend of Béranger's Péronne days, one M. Quénescourt, came to his aid. This assistance of Quénescourt drew the songster, as it were by a thread of destiny, back towards his old home and his real vocation. His patron, we have seen, had laid out for him more substantial and solemn occupation. Somewhere about this time, too, Béranger fell under the spell of M. Chateaubriand, and planned a 'Clovis,' which was to make him famous among the writers of epics. But the humour of aunt Bouvet's tavern at Péronne, which town he revisited from time to time, and the lively welcome which the ex-printer's boy met there from his old comrades, proved stronger than Neir or Clovis, than the counsels of the well-meaning Prince, than the fascinations of the eloquent romancer. Béranger was born to make songs. Although he was poorly endowed with voice (as Moore and many another enchanting singer have been), he was invited to tune up a stave at every little festival and supper. He never did so, almost improvising the words sometimes, without his chorus of applause. '*Mes chansons c'est moi*,' his well-known declaration, may, we fancy, be read according to its most literal sense in Béranger's warm-hearted allusions to Quénescourt and to Laisnez, the old master-printer, with whom he had lived as apprentice. He commemorates, too, how he got into a scrape with the touchy Picards, by venting a *vaudeville* in ridicule of the awkwardness of a society of archers. For this he had to fly the country, and, on his return, to atone for the offence by another ditty, half sardonic, half penitent. Some seven years of this sort of incoherent life had still to be passed, ere his talent was developed in all its perfection of form. It was still groping—still undecided. The autobiographical record of this period gives us a specimen of elegiac verse (one among many of its kind) in which the melancholy strings played on by Millevoye and Chénier are those tried by Béranger—and not those which ere long were to sound so merrily under the vaults of the *Caveau*—and so maliciously at the doors of King's chambers.

About this time he lost his father by apoplexy. It is a proof of the sweetness of his nature, that he chronicles the death of one who had never been a parent to him, with artless regret—'he died,' says Béranger, 'at the moment 'when I hoped to have the means of making some happy days 'for him.' ' Soon after this, the poet's sister and his aunt (not the liberal aunt Bouvet, we are happy to say) broke other family ties for him, by betaking themselves to the cloister. This he did his best to oppose, partly, from his own aversion to a

cassock; partly because he feared that Sophie, his sister, might have adopted her determination with the delicate purpose of ridding him from the burden of her maintenance. He felt this unjust:—because he knew himself to be not one of those who suffer under such burdens. To him the selfishness born of solitude would have been far more exhausting than any responsibility. Subsequently, brother and sister met rarely; the latter, however, was the survivor; and appeared at his death-bed, to persuade him to that open recantation and reconciliation on which the devout members of her Church have always laid such stress. The world, which in judging of others is especially apt to take matters of opinion for granted, and to strain more of earnest purpose into sport than was ever contemplated, has greatly exaggerated the irreligion and the scepticism of one so light-hearted, so sharply-tongued, as the *chansonnier*. Those who have the fatal gift of ridicule can never be fairly measured,—least of all by duller persons. In looking over the mass of anecdote and testimony before us,—in recalling the friendships and intimacies of Béranger's life,—in considering as a whole his songs, with express reference to the licence which,—be it right or wrong, has always been awarded to the songster,—in recollecting the time (yet more the country) of Béranger,—we are justified in separating him from the frivolous scorners at all things real and holy, from the bitter and destructive sceptics, with whom he has been excusably confounded. A graceless repartee lingers long in the ear. The timid, elderly woman, may have tried to do a sister's part in reclaiming one presumed by her to be in deep peril; but the tale neither for her, nor against him, nor *vice versa*, was worth the telling as it has been told by M. Lapointe and others.

Enough of a digression into which we have been led by accident—the family events adverted to bring us near to the moment at which the poet may be fairly said to have entered on his own path. The fruits of the twenty years which followed, small as they seem in volume, and trifling in form, made him one of the most famous men in Europe. They established him as a power, the strength of which was proved by the influence it exercised after his withdrawal into a retirement which lasted half a century. The name of Béranger, about the year 1813, reached the wits and singers of the *Caveau*, a club presided over by the facile Désaugiers, the merriment of which, says Béranger, 'was in singular contrast with the misfortunes at that juncture threatening France.' The pale, poor, prematurely bald man of thirty-three, was too serious, if not too shy,

to be wholly at his ease, or to feel himself on an equality with such a society of gay companions—men, who did not disdain to dine anywhere — no matter how unknown the *Amphitryon* — and to sing whatever sorts of song might be bespoken, provided the dinner was choice, and the wine good, and the company jovial. There were other disqualifications for Béranger which made his presence at the *Caveau* only short-lived. The statutes of that club remind us of the criticism of the tailor who rebuked the Ettrick Shepherd for being ‘affectit’ when Hogg corrected the bad Scotch burden of one of his own songs, by singing the same into good grammar. It was a canon in the *Caveau* that the *chanson* was not to be poetical. *A like judgment seems to have been passed out of doors: since we are told in M. Lapointe’s book that, for a long time, M. de Lamartine refused to read a line by Béranger, and ignored him because he was ‘only a *chansonnier*, and therefore no poet.’ Where will not prejudice hide? It is curious, in following out this class distinction, to note the phrase cool to depreciation, with which Paul Louis Courier (whose prose stands near the place where Béranger’s verse stands, in regard to its finish, in-bred liberalism, and habitual opposition to arbitrary power) dismisses a ‘*Sieur de Béranger*,’ his fellow-prisoner, whose ditties had subjected him to government prosecution.

To return, however—for a while, enchanted by the wit in Béranger’s rhymes, the racy simplicity of his manners, and his want of pretension and envy, every thing was waived by the careless men of the *Caveau*. They did not see—not care, perhaps—how far he was to leave them behind. He was elected unanimously: one person only, an old time-serving Chevalier de Pils, protesting against the new member. But Béranger did not take cordially to the confraternity. The politics of some, the slipshod principles of others, the green-room vulgarities and jokes of all, did not suit his good sense and nice taste. Cheerfully hospitable as he became in his own house, so soon as his means permitted it, he was never fond of wine (he expressly tells us), least of all when the host considered that the ‘champagne’ or *romanée* paid the guest for his gaiety. As a lyrist Béranger presently shot a-head of Désaugiers; and the two men, without final quarrel, became separated by political differences and ceased to be at ease in each other’s company. Whether it was by chance or as following out a deliberate project, or as an inevitable consequence of his education, can never be known; but by degrees, besides singing the *Lisettes* and *Fretilions*, who seem to be a part of every song-writer’s established stock-in-trade, whether he rise to the lyre of Anacreon, or stoop to ‘The

‘Mountain Daisy,’ Béranger began to sharpen his rhyme so as to make it a weapon of opposition,—to take professionally the side against authority, bigotry, imbecility in high places.

This mood of his mind — this direction of his genius — was traversed by a thread of romantic faith and superstition, which has puzzled many of his censors. Let it never be forgotten that a poet’s life, be it even as well ordered and squared by common sense as was Béranger’s, can hardly exist without its inconsistency — without its outlet for human weakness as well as for human sympathy. In his autobiography, it is true, Béranger tries to explain and to define his hero-worship of Napoleon; to point out that in some sort he was rather persistently Anti-Bourbon (in the interests of France) than inconsistently subdued by the fascinations of ‘*le petit Caporal*’ — but these are reasonings after the fact — reasonings moreover contradicted by the glow and fervour and faith of some of the posthumous songs the other day published. The Napoleonism of Béranger’s songs is the enthusiasm of one possessed — not persuaded; and it was this possession, this breathing of an unreasoning, and unreasonable madness — it was this, together with the growing polish and tenderness of his love poems, and with his disposition to deal with the sorrows, the affections, and the hopes of the lowly-born and the simply-bred, — which, early in his career, gave him so fast a hold on the heart of France, — placed him among its most characteristic writers, — and among the few whose nationality has flavour and universality enough to give them a country in every land where poetry is read and music sung. Shakspeare, Molière, Cervantes, Lafontaine, Scott, — be their statures ever so different, are none of them more completely citizens of the world, than the singer of the ‘Shepherd and the Stars,’ or the ‘Remembrances of the People.’

Yet more, the exquisite finish of the song in Béranger’s hands, must be dwelt on as one main element of his permanence — of him, too, it may be said, ‘that in his hands the thing became ‘a trumpet.’ There is no lyric poetry in existence in which awkwardness of burden, difficulties of language, incompleteness of imagery, or superfluity of sentiment for sound’s sake, are so little to be felt as in Béranger’s. Metastasio is not more fluent — Petrarch not more condensed — Quarles not more epigrammatic — Herrick little sweeter. It is not altogether their meaning, but in part, too, the perfection of their polish, which makes the best of Béranger’s songs so untranslatable. Never has imaginative literature shown more charming proof, that aridity of soil need not mean sterility of blossom. The songs are like the heaths of the Cape, — exquisite in form, texture, daintiness of colour, honeyed

sweetness, and richness of herbage, albeit they spring up in the stony and sandy wilderness. Many of them are based on the tunes of the *guinguette*—on the vulgar burden of the street ballad-monster—on some odd *vaudeville* dance or melody, which, however familiar to the public, must be always strange to any one having the poet's pure sense and feeling, and for limits the gamut of French language. In his later efforts, Béranger rose from the song into the ode, from jingle into music, from jargon into fancies mostly noble (if not always chaste). Yet there is hardly one of the whole series, which an artist,—be he musician, be he fitter of language, be he teller of a story, may not consider, and in which he will not find something, as regards his art, to learn. We do not imagine Béranger in any respect to have exaggerated facts, when, as an old man, he adverts to the solicitude, the patience, the adoption of sharp criticism, the study of euphony, and elegance, and pertinence, which the completion of his lyrics cost him. About a dozen a year, he somewhere says, were as much as he could produce. At one of the last visits paid him before his death by M. Thiers, whose society he enjoyed, the retired statesman said to the poet, "They call you, you know, the French Horace." "*Qu'en dirait l'autre?*"—"What does the other Horace say to that?" was Béranger's charming reply.

With the above general remarks the reader will probably be satisfied; nor expect any attempt at reproduction, translation, paraphrase, of poems, now as well known to most of our educated countrymen, as Molière's best scenes. The same considerations apply to Béranger's posthumous songs. The best success in shadowing out works of such exquisite finish and feeling, within limits so arbitrary, must be a lame and spiritless version, of a lively, breathing, original poem. But our tracing of the life of the poet has still to be completed: not in regard to its political bearings and importance,—since these we conceive to have been exaggerated on every side for party purposes; but as offering a picture of self-knowledge, common sense, and kindness, rare among persons situated as he was—tempted as he was—and not, as may be inferred from the Bonapartist enthusiasm—devoid of poetical frenzy, as well as of prosaic firmness. In the hey-day and maturity of his success, Béranger seems to have come to a full agreement with himself:—to have been able to say, 'Thus far will I go, no further.' 'Thus will I live, and in no other way.' It may be doubted, whether ever any one divined his future better than this French songster did, in despite of certain disclaimers. But in such divination lay a strength which belongs to few masters of

the '*gai science*.' A master of his art, lifted by circumstances into a strange and strong position, Béranger was a man of honour,—and as such resolute not to falsify himself. It was lost labour to offer him honours, appointments, wealth; yet he would be neither sour nor sycophantish. His taste for good company—a taste which must be based on a shrewd appreciation of character, not of class,—prevented him from sullenly secluding himself, as other fancied liberals have done, from the advances of the refined and influential. Nevertheless he would accept neither tie nor bribe from the best and the most subtle among them. He knew how to decline offers of service with as much grace as others throw into the act of acceptance. He knew how to serve others. Among the many letters which give Béranger a high rank among letter-writers,—some giving advice, some tendering compliment, some advancing an intercession, some declining academical or political greatness, few are more remarkable than the one addressed by him to M. Laffitte, on the occasion of the government prosecution of 1828, when Béranger's potent friend, apprehending that the impending sentence might take the heavy form of years of captivity, bestirred himself to induce the song-writer to make some arrangements with his prosecutors, in order to mitigate the sentence or avert the trial.

'My dear friend,' (writes the contumacious poet of opposition in France) 'do not set yourself to believe that I am not grateful for what you did yesterday. I assure you that I am touched by it, without any need of reflection to make me so;—but I have thought it well to ponder all that you said, and I cannot conceal from you, that the measure proposed, torments me. I am persuaded that it has, to yourself, cost *you* something; but without discussing this point, the result of which could only add to my value for this new proof of your friendship—let us consider what advantage I could derive from the arrangement in question.

'No, no—I owe it to my character, to the public, to my advocate himself—to protest against this mode of proceeding. As to my sentence being reduced to a *minimum*—of what good would that be? Is it very important to me? On the contrary: the stronger my punishment, the more odious will appear the authors of my condemnation. If then, I have only six months of prison, I promise you, that I will take every imaginable precaution to avoid illness and the indulgence of the hospital. A longer confinement might, doubtless, bring down my pride—but then, see what I should have gained by your arrangements!—Shame of having abandoned a defence, the principles of which may be useful—dissatisfaction at myself, and, perhaps, a check to that popularity of mine, which they wish, vainly, to dispute, and which is a necessity to my talent!

'There can be no mistake about it, my friend—I am popular, and

my popularity is great, to say the least of it. Do you know that in the *cafés*, in the markets, everywhere, people are more interested about my trial, than about Prussia, Russia, or Turkey?

‘You know me well enough to know that the desire for scandal and riot is not that which urges me; but the question is, to proclaim a useful principle—the question is, to defend it with courage, and in that both my duty and my character as a man of honour are at stake. It is in vain that your friendship has proved what already I knew well,—which is, that I make war at my own cost, and that the sharper are the blows which may be struck in my name, the more I shall be exposed to a thousand little vengeance. I answer, “It is duty.” As to my health, to which you appeal, you rate my health too cheaply. Take courage, this life of mine is sufficiently tough!

‘As to money—imprisonment would soon make an end of that: I know that in prison every thing is costly; but after all, should my purse be empty. I should know how to fill it. You are at hand. I would then do, what your offers, repeated a hundred times, have never made me do till now. I shall come and ask you for money, when mine is all gone, and I will not ask it, not even as a loan, if your friendship will have it so. You see that I think of every thing.

‘Once again, only see, in the plan which you yesterday submitted to me, that if authority appeared to give back, in the face of such a piece of pleading, the accused person gives back too, before the power whom his defence might affront.—Suppose, for an instant, that you alone were the public; and ask yourself, if being witness to a comedy of the sort, you would not try to discover the “wheel within wheel;” and if such discovery would not take away something from the esteem, from the interest, which you had entertained for the accused person?—Believe me, my dear Lafitte, there are moments in which the most modest of men has need to exaggerate his own value: and I think that I am now in one of these moments. Let us take the worst side of things—They put me in prison for many years—I have good right then, to think that France would utter a cry of indignation at it. Let us go further—I die in the jail-irons. Have I not, then, right to think also, during half a century at least, my death would remain as a reproach of blood to the memory of certain people;—and know you, that it would be the most terrible accusation which could be brought against the memory of Charles the Tenth? I have sacrificed too many good things of the present to I know not what vain love of glory and virtue, for you not to pardon my madness for this manner of considering certain things.

‘Examine then my reasons—weigh them well, and especially the purity of my intentions and the clearness of my actual position; tell me if, in actual truth, your views are not rather those of a friendship which takes fright, than the counsels of a still and cold wisdom. Yours with all my heart, &c.’

More elegant specimens from Béranger’s pen could have been paraphrased; but few more earnest letters, it seems to us, have ever been written by Frenchmen than this. We cannot

wonder that a man who in the hour of temptation was so clear as to what he ought and what he ought not to do, should be able to arrange for himself a life which satisfied his desires. This, it is obvious, Béranger did. Vain, and what poet is not vain?—virtuous beyond the virtue of rhymesters—addicted to a butterfly-calling such as the world has assumed him to be—the French *chansonnier* played for position. He won it—wiser in nothing than in comprehending, that together with position, such a man as he should not desire to enjoy luxury, official predominance, great fortune, and perpetual variety. His reasons for retiring from the great stage on which his small songs had moved such myriads of listeners, have been explained by himself too often, and of late have been too unscrupulously canvassed to require minute recapitulation.—Let us, however, glance at them from without. Possibly Béranger may have felt that accident had set him on a pinnacle, from which a few motions more might precipitate him downwards. Possibly he may have seen, that the combinations and changes of French politics which succeeded ‘the glorious days of July’ did not offer to the Tyræus or Pasquin of France (as might be) the subjects which more stirring and sterner times had done. He was aware of time creeping on, and with this may have felt the yearning to satisfy himself in his works, more importunate year by year. He had acquired a sufficiency for his modest desires; he had old friends in and about his home; he had new friends from all countries, watching for him and waiting on him. He commanded privileges such as only belong to distinguished persons, who retire, without utter departure from the scene of action. As a *chansonnier*, he might have felt increasingly troubled what or whom to sing, or how to sing it to a new tune. A celebrity in retreat, he could enjoy life in many younger lives. A poor man, he still held a mastery over the riches of others. Madame Colet, the hot-headed; M. Lapointe, the superstitious chronicler of his protector’s perfections; M. Guizot the Minister—M. de Lamartine the high-souled,—all these agree in their testimony to Béranger’s indefatigable kindness to many obscure persons who had a right (and often no right) to claim his good offices. He was chivalrous, beneficent, blithe, unwearied. A relation of his entered a convent, Béranger dowered her; aware (for he has said as much) that in such retreat she might find a peaceful life, otherwise out of her reach. She died almost at the moment of her reception. Béranger declined to receive the dowry back, which (to the honour of all round) was tendered. In his intercourse with uneducated poets, Béranger never seems to have become sour; never (a frequent consequence of elevation

like his) to have Pharisaically said, '*We, the few;*'—never to have bowed out the awkward petitioner with a barren aphorism. His letters to brethren of the humbler class should be collected, as a series of admirable counsels, couched in the most delicate and polished language. He refused academical honours with a sincerity which could not be questioned. He shrunk from the responsibilities of political life, though they were pressed on him, after the wild days of 1848, when it was presumed that he might be tempted to emerge from his hermitage to take a curule chair as an honoured member of the Republican government. There was no moving him a hair's breadth. On the other hand, who could be so forward in asking, so facile in granting, as he, — when his good offices were claimed by versifying jeweller or fairy-telling shoemaker, or mad ill-instructed muse,—and when his influence with financiers or place-givers could serve the petitioner? Till within the very last few months before Béranger's death, his kindly activity never slackened; neither his enjoyment in making others enjoy. We must dwell for a moment on the bereavement and warning which, during the last few months, he accepted patiently, as a summons to go hence; since it is one, without some attention to which, no character of the man and no sketch of his simple and secluded existence can by possibility be complete.

Among the other phenomena of Béranger's history, which indicate how completely he managed to secure for himself a private life, with which 'no stranger should intermeddle,' none is more singular than the female figure which crossed the scene during his youth, and whose unobtrusive return during his later days quickened the curiosity of the public scandal-monger, and calls out the defence of zealous and charitable friends. Béranger was not like Dean Swift, with his *Stella* and *Vanessa*—as little, so far as can be made out, did he share Goethe's humour in loving, leaving, and lamenting, or lecturing on, the victims of his heart's inconstancy. Still less may we assume him to have resembled the devout and darkened Cowper, to whom the ministrations of his 'Mary' amounted for many years to the difference betwixt ease and torture, to the redemption of sanity from madness. Nevertheless, Béranger's life-friendship with Mademoiselle Judith Frère will never cease to be canvassed by any one writing of the lives and loves of Poets.

'Collectors of anecdotes,' say the executors of Béranger, who have added a copious appendix to his Autobiography, 'have been totally mistaken in much that they have hazarded on the story of Mademoiselle Judith Frère.' In this censure

M. de Lamartine must be included when, following popular report, he speaks of her as 'a Clorinda of fifteen,' whose masculine manners and self-protecting deportment naturally belonged to one who had entered life as an assistant in a fencing-school. Some tale like this has been told so often as almost to have passed into history. But Béranger's editors explicitly assert that it is a mis-statement. There was a professor of fence, it is true, one M. Levallois, whose niece the poet knew well;—this was Madame Redoute, who was also niece (by marriage?) of the well-known monographist of the Rose. Judith Frère was her cousin-german. Neither the one nor the other woman, we are assured, ever touched the foils of M. Levallois. But she who was destined to become 'La Bonne Vieille' of the songster, was an affectionate and tenderly-nurtured girl. Béranger made her acquaintance in 1796, when she was eighteen years of age, at the house of her very respectable aunt, who had brought the girl up, and who, in 1818, left her such remains of fortune as the Revolution had spared. Judith was beautiful when young, we are told. Till her old age she preserved the art of singing gracefully,—she was full of good sense and good counsel. In these touches we have, probably, a portrait touched with super-refinement. Few persons, however, who know women—French women especially—will fail to admit that, whether Mademoiselle Judith had been the *Britomart* of the fencing academy, or really was of the more delicate and gracious quality here described, her constancy to one so little calculated to please a lady's eye as Béranger—prematurely bald, with a rough, irregular face—simply mannered, and poor—of itself implied that superiority of nature, that prophetic justice of appreciation, which prove their possessor to have been no ordinary woman. Be these things as they may,—from eighteen to eighty Judith was the attached and honoured friend of the singer. Being originally the wealthier of the two, she assisted the poet when he needed it. She comforted him with her sympathy, without, so far as can be made out, hampering him or chaining him. In fact, the very tales which Béranger's executors here profess to demolish, prove that, year after year, such a person as the woman was hardly known to exist—while the man was rising and sought for, and, year by year, was becoming an object of increasing curiosity. Yet it may have been during this very period of her own obscurity, that *her* voice spoke the most tenderly to the anxious heart of the struggling poet,—that *her* hand supported him the more steadily, because the being who held out the hand remained unseen. Late in the afternoon of their lives, in 1835, when he had ceased to give out his songs, when she was no longer blooming, this steady, affectionate, discerning woman emerged

from the shadow, took her place as the genius of Béranger's 'calm fireside,'—superintended his modest household;—kept some order with his immoderate charities, as the most charitable of women will do, and established her social consequence among his friends. These were only the best men and the best minds of France, and by every memorialist she is mentioned with a word of remark, and with an epithet of distinction, which could not belong to her position so much as to herself. Of course an association like theirs could not exist without the tongues of Paris—foul as well as fair—loosing themselves;—just as if tongues could disturb friendship, or destroy gratitude! A statement appeared in the papers that Béranger had married his servant; in answer to which Béranger put forward one of the most remarkable among his many remarkable letters, addressed to the editor of the '*Assemblée Nationale*,' in which, without giving a single fact, without compromising any living creature, he maintained his right to arrange a quiet household how he pleased,—and vindicated *her* position while speaking of his with regard to Mademoiselle Frère. We have no evidence in the whole story: merely a few impressions. M. de Lamartine assumes that they were privately married; but M. de Lamartine is given to assumption. Any one weighing the episode with a view to the moral worth of its actors, will do well to recollect that France is not England, that the idea of tie and obligation among our neighbours is not ours. But having, and with purpose, referred to Dean Swift and Goethe, and possessing no data beyond the few which we have just sketched, one fact remains—-that one is touching enough. The two life-companions, whether married or unmarried, mere friends or old lovers, died beneath the same roof. The woman, who was the elder, died the first,—as Béranger had always, unselfishly and affectionately, hoped Judith *would* die. He was willing to bear the loneliness, the desolation, after sixty years of confidential intercourse. There is something here different from the heartless sentimentalism of Swift and Goethe. Let the tale remain in a cloud, as it will possibly remain till doomsday, the cloud is nevertheless one through the skirts of which some innate brightness pierces.

How far in the above attempt to delineate the character of Béranger as citizen, poet, or man of sense, we have wrought out, or included, the salient points of his life and genius, others must decide. It seems to us that it would serve no good purpose to expatiate on the often-told story of his prosecutions and imprisonments by the Bourbon government—as little to offer a deliberate review of his posthumous songs. Concerning the merit of these the world will be, of course, for a while

disagreed. Let our successors, a quarter of a century hence, set right (if so it must be) the judgment which we venture to offer,—not without deliberation, that in no respect will they detract from the poet's reputation. Their interest may be less temporary than that of their predecessors; but the music of many among them is freer than in Béranger's former ditties, where a burden of '*Zon Zon*' or '*Biribi*' had to decide the cut of the verse, and sometimes the cast of the thought. To retrospective critics they will be none the less characteristic or sweet because of 'the dear old tune' (so Béranger cherished it) of Napoleonism running through certain of the strains.

To bear out our appreciation of the man as universal in his tastes in the midst of his active (sometimes acrid) liberalism, we might have made out a list of his friends, ranging betwixt Judith Frère, —and Manuel, the Deputy, in whose tomb he begged to be laid,—and M. Chateaubriand, who wearied him with his self-occupation and solemnity, — and M. Lamennais, who ground coffee at his fireside, and who used (as Coleridge did to Highgate visitors) somewhat to beset him with those strange half-philosophies, which heretics aver are *no* philosophies at all,—and the late Duke of Orleans, urbane, facile, and courteous, eager to be conversant with what is best of the best in every world, — and M. Lapointe, the workman-poet, who had the privilege of watching his death-nights, — and the present Empress of France, whose offers of kindly service (he said) it cost him much to reject. In the list of Béranger's friends, too, would figure painters, actors, — M. Wilhem, the popular musician, — M. Perrotin, who was a right loyal and royal publisher, and best, and last, old comrades of his Péronne and garret days, to whom he had cloven, to them and to their descendants, and who smoothed his pillow when the agony of death fell on him. It is enough to sketch the list:—since even these indications will suffice to show that the world, miscalled and maligned as it is, did not fail one whom it had loved, so long as there was breath in him. Béranger died, worn out by slow decay succeeded by sharp *maladies*, in the midst of a thunderstorm,— lovingly tended, and, as was seen by the events of the few following hours, microscopically watched to the last. The State protected his funeral with military pomp and precaution. His songs may remain as a heritage for French singers long after government shall have swept away government, and colour have effaced colour, and family have succeeded to family. There is as much of posterity, of future, as well as of present and past, in them, as in any works, great or small, which have passed before us since we took leave of the poet some five-and-twenty years since.

ART. VIII. — *Lites ac Res Gestæ inter Polonos Ordinemque Cruciferorum.* Three vols. 4to. Posnanix: 1855-56.

THIS work attracts our notice as a literary curiosity, which is probably known to very few persons in this country. The interest with which we have perused it is heightened by the fact that it reaches us from a nation better known by its political calamities than by its recent services to literature, and we rejoice at this evidence that the intellectual cultivation of Poland survives her dismemberment. Nor is the work less remarkable as a contribution to one of the most obscure portions of the history of mediæval Europe—not indeed attractive in form, but extremely curious as serving to lay bare the foundations of one of the oldest institutions of the North. Even Dean Milman, in his comprehensive survey of Latin Christianity, has contented himself with borrowing from Voigt's Prussian History a brief sketch of the destinies of that Order which carried the warfare against heathenism to the shores of the Baltic, and the writers to whom he refers as the historians of the Knights have all taken the Germanic view of the achievements of their countrymen. But these volumes are altogether Polish, and they present the Order, and some of the transactions in which it was engaged, in a light not yet familiar to historical inquirers.

The same age which saw the destruction of the proudest Order of Christian chivalry, witnessed also an effort less effectual, but not less determined, for the overthrow of an Order destined to exercise a more permanent influence on the political condition of Europe. Five and twenty years had passed away since the last Grand Master of the Templars denounced at the stake the falsehoods of his accusers, when the Papal legates at Warsaw sat in judgment on the claims of the kings of Poland against the Teutonic Knights of the Hospital of St. Mary in Jerusalem. Their sentence of restitution and compensation was contemptuously set at nought by the Brethren: and the Lithuanian Jagello, who by marriage had obtained the Polish throne, was compelled, nearly a century afterwards, to carry his quarrel from the battle-field to the council-chamber at Constance, and seek from the lips of Martin V. and Sigismund a decision more effectual than any which he had won by his counsels or his sword.

These volumes contain the legal documents connected with both these trials, together with the letters or rescripts on which the rival powers relied for the enforcement of their claims. As a specimen of typography, they are sumptuous: and they are

enriched with many elaborate facsimiles of seals and manuscripts. The work is dedicated to the memory of Lord Dudley Stuart; and the editor, Count Dzialynski, himself a member of that nation to whose cause Lord Dudley Stuart devoted his life and energies, describes the motives and objects of the publication which has cost him so much time and labour, in words that must excite sympathy even where they may not enforce his political conclusions. Desiring fervently to see his country once more reckoned among the nations, he has edited documents which he admits to be not merely dry, as written in the corrupt Latin of the Middle Ages, but repulsive from the constant repetition of almost endless quarrels and acts of cruelty, robbery, and murder, perpetrated by the Teutonic Knights. Still to him they are not without attraction, as recording also the issue of the conflict. The day which saw Albert of Brandenburg exchange his title of Grand Master of the Teutonic Hospitallers for the dukedom of Eastern Prussia, is to Count Dzialynski the commencement of a golden era for the Polish kingdom and nation, a happy omen of better fortune still in store for his countrymen. But he looks for this issue not so much to any convulsive efforts as to the progress of law and order; and the example he has himself set, by publishing at great cost, some of the manuscript treasures of a fine library, is at least a liberal contribution to the cause he has at heart.

If the manuscripts which he has edited do not altogether bear out his opinions or warrant all his hopes, they serve an important purpose in throwing light on a long contest which is but little known, and furnishing much valuable information on the means by which it was carried on,—as much indeed as it would be reasonable to expect in a struggle in which both sides were more anxious for the success than for the truth of their cause.

The first document given is entitled, ‘The Register of the Kingdom of Poland, compiled and restored by John Dlugosch, senior canon of Cracow (himself the author of a history of Poland), in the year 1479;’ and it contains the judicial proceedings against the Teutonic Order before the legates of Benedict XII., in 1339. A long series of citations served on Theodoric, Burgrave of Aldenburg, the Grand Master, is followed by a list of the various points urged on behalf of Kasimir III. (the Great) king of Poland. These assert that the fortresses of Thorn, Gdansk (Dantzic), Swiecz, Gnesna, &c., and the whole country of Pomerania, unlawfully occupied by the Order, are within the limits of the Polish kingdom,—that the Order had been already sentenced by the legates of

John XXII. to make restitution and compensation,—that they had not only defied this sentence, but had subsequently seized on the territory of Cujavia and Dobryn.

The origin of the Order, the mode of their introduction into Northern Europe, the means by which they had gained so strong a footing in Poland, are brought out in the course of the depositions with remarkable harmony among the witnesses, who seem to have been guided chiefly by oral tradition. But while the evidence of some is little better than mere hearsay, others describe facts and scenes in which they had themselves been agents or eye-witnesses.

The Order could already boast of an existence of nearly 150 years. Their beginning had been humble, their object purely one of charity. In the disastrous siege of Acre, which so miserably distinguished the third crusade, a few German merchants, from the coasts of the Baltic, sought to mitigate the sufferings of the besiegers by running up the sails of their ships into tents for the sick and dying. Their good offices attracted the attention of the Emperor and the Pope: and they continued to aid and shelter German pilgrims till the crusade of Frederic II. Then under their fourth Grand Master, Herman de Salza, the personal friend of the Emperor, the Order rose to distinction: and possibly at the suggestion, certainly with the sanction, of Frederic II. and Gregory IX., the more distant shores of the Baltic became the scene of its subsequent career. The circumstances of Conrad, regent of Poland for Boleslas V., concurred with the aims of the Knights. The neighbourhood of the savage Prutheni was a constant source of annoyance; and he hailed the arrival of these allies, who had forsaken the chamber of the suffering for the battlefield, as a happy means for procuring their conversion or their extirpation. He assigned to them the territory of Culm, on the Vistula, for a term of twenty years, as a crusading ground against all enemies of the faith of Christ. This compact, of which the Knights deny all knowledge but which there seems little or no reason to call in question, was not fulfilled; but the kingdom of Poland was so weak, or the Teutonic Order so strong, that in 1307 Vladislas IV. was glad to entrust to their keeping, for a time, the fortress of Gdansk against the attacks of the Marquis of Brandenburg. The service was performed, the compact again broken or forgotten: and for this want of memory or of honesty, they were condemned by the legates of John XXII. to restore the fortress, and make amends in money for its detention. To this sentence they gave no heed, and they remained in consequence under the ban of the Papal excommunication: but in the interval

which passed between this event and his death Vladislas IV. was not idle. He had found the Papal censures but a poor weapon against the avarice and treachery of the Knights; and in three expeditions he sought, with various success, to make them feel the force of purely secular chastisements. In the last of these he is said, in 1331, to have been victorious, in a battle in which 20,000 of the troops of the Order were slain. The whole expedition had indeed been characterised by every species of cruelty and excess. Neither age nor weakness arrested the sword of the conqueror: and Vladislas, having almost but not quite succeeded in his heart's desire, bequeathed their final annihilation, as the special work of his reign, to his son, Kasimir III.

It was this old quarrel which the legates of Benedict XII. had to decide: but when they insisted on the fact of the previous sentence of John XXII., the Grand Master replied by a protest and appeal, which the legates rejected as vexatious and frivolous. The protest of Theodoric had reference to the terrible cruelties of Vladislas: and the total silence of all the witnesses as to this frightful tragedy, shows the danger of drawing negative conclusions from what may seem the most impartial and rigorous of judicial investigations. By all of them the campaign of 1331 is laid entirely to the charge of the Knights: the attack, the cruelties, the murders, are all begun and carried on by them: and the charge is pressed with a vehemence which never pauses to reflect that the better cause had been practically made the worse.

The most important facts connected with this history are brought out in the examination of John Bishop of Posen (vol. i. p. 77.), and of his nephew Presdrew, a canon of Posen, the brother and son of Bogussa, governor of Dantzic at the time of its occupation by the Knights. The account which both agree in giving of the transaction of this period, however much it may prove the avarice or the faithlessness of the Order, betrays the most lamentable weakness on the part of the Polish king. In the very country which was regarded as the most precious appendage of the Polish crown, and in its most important fortress, the viceroy of Vladislas found himself unable to cope with the many enemies who, in the words of Presdrew, had risen up, owing to the utter weakness of the king. Against the most important of these, the Marquis of Brandenburg, Bogussa, looked in vain to Vladislas for aid. To his application for assistance or removal from the government of Dantzic, Vladislas replied by confessing his inability to help, but recommending him to get what he might require by robbing

and spoiling the territory (vol. i. p. 79.). The more tender conscience of Bogussa recoiled from this expedient; and, as a more agreeable alternative, he offered to put the Teutonic Knights in possession of a part of the fortress until they received from the king full compensation for the labour and expenses which they might incur in helping him to guard the city. The Knights, having once gained admission, showed little sign of resting contented with a divided authority. A series of insults offered to Bogussa was followed by his expulsion, with the promise, however, that the fort should be again made over to his keeping so soon as the Order had received full satisfaction from Vladislas. Dantzic was thus in their hands. The treachery of one of the garrison soon opened to them the fortress of Sweckze: and the whole land of Pomerania, which its duke Mistiwog had in 1296 solemnly ceded to King Prezemislas, submitted to the sway of the Order; and, as Vladislas proved unable to produce the sum at which the Knights valued their services, their grasp was not relaxed.

Of the cruelties and excesses which attended these aggressions, the bishop and his nephew speak in the forcible language of men who have themselves been sufferers. The former had had his house burnt and his property plundered; but when asked if he knew the faces of the Grand Master or any of his Knights, he replied, not unnaturally, that he did not, and that he had no wish to know them, his object being to escape as quickly as he could from men, who, if they could have caught him, would certainly have killed him (vol. i. p. 84.). But while his memory is clear as to the time of these calamities, he omits to state that the year of their occurrence (1331) was also the year of the terrible expedition of Vladislas, and that this may have had some share in causing the ravages of which he so feelingly complains. In his own evidence he is also silent with regard to another fact, which, if true, might be pleaded in further extenuation of their offences. According to the testimony of Andrew, chancellor of the cathedral of Posen, the Teutonic Knights had suffered such grievous rebuffs at the hands of the Lithuanians and Prussians who had been committed to their pastoral care, that they brought to Vladislas the keys of the fortresses in the territory of Culm, saying that they were unable to hold them against the savages whom they had undertaken to convert. And his authority for this statement is John Bishop of Posen himself.

It is singular, indeed, to find the witnesses frequently claiming numerous authorities for their assertions, and when asked to name some or any, urging their numbers or their death as a

reason for forgetting all. It is strange again to find Albert, dean of Ploetz (vol. i. p. 99.), avowing total ignorance of so notorious a fact as the condemnation of the Knights by the legates of John XXII., which the bishop of Posen (himself one of the commission for the citation of the Grand Master) relates with the most minute particulars. But it can be no matter for surprise, in a contest where both sides grasped at every possible proof that might further their cause, to find many links weak or worthless and much evidence inconclusive. Deeds of cession on the part of rulers, acts of consent on the part of the people, are urged by the King of Poland as the evidence for his right to certain provinces of his kingdom, together with the more curious reason that those provinces must be part of Poland because they pay Peter's pence, a tribute paid by Poland alone of all the countries of north-eastern Europe.

There is a strange monotony in the history of the Teutonic Order. The suit, instituted by Kasimir the Great, ended, like the previous one, with a legatine sentence, which condemned the Knights to pay the sum of 194,500 marks, together with all costs on both sides. This sentence was as little heeded as the former one; and, four years later, Kasimir was constrained to accept the mediation of the Kings of Hungary and Bohemia, and to yield up to the Order the absolute possession of Cujavia, Culm, and Michalów. But the progress and tactics of the brethren continued unchanged, and Jagello found himself, as Vladislav V., much in the same relation to them as his more fiery namesake Vladislav IV. The chieftain of the savage Lithuanians had embraced Christianity, had aided in the conversion of his subjects, had made vigorous efforts against the restless and aggressive Order, and, like Vladislav IV., had defeated them in a tremendous battle which almost destroyed their forces. But his victory produced no permanent result. Another compromise was followed, as before, by an appeal to the spiritual power, and the victor of Tannenberg was driven to plead the cause of his kingdom before the Council of Constance.

The depositions which were taken in consequence of this later trial, are given at length in the second volume. In character they differ but little from those given in the first, if we allow for the force of time in weakening oral tradition. The evidence is more geographical and less personal, and some of the witnesses appear to be less trustworthy, and their assertions less credible. Amongst them we meet (vol. ii. p. 167.) with one Nicolas Schathcowski, a citizen of Posen, who re-

presents himself as 150 years of age, and makes the astounding statement that his father, who lived nearly 200 years, had seen Boleslas I., surnamed Khobri, who, crowned King of Poland by Otho III., had died in 1025. The worthy citizen forgot that even a larger margin was requisite to make his tale consistent; but we need hardly resort to the Returns of the Registrar-General to decide against the existence at the present time of any man whose father might have witnessed the closing-scenes of the Wars of the Roses.

The third volume is taken up in part with the examination, by the advocates of the King of Poland, of the documents on which the Teutonic Knights relied for the support of their claims. The donations and concessions of Gregory IX., Alexander IV., and Clement IV., of Frederic II., of the Dukes of Mazovia, and the regent Conrad, are all impugned for various reasons, but chiefly on the ground of forgery. This charge is especially pressed against the papal letters, as being the more agreeable alternative to men who were determined to set aside their contents, yet shrunk from questioning the plenary authority of the donor. The detection of forgery may be an easy or a most difficult task. Gross chronological blunders or a too manifest bias may (as in the case of the Decretals) prove a series of documents to be spurious; but it is doubtful whether objections purely negative can be allowed to have much weight. It may be unwise to conclude that Frederic II. was not the writer of certain letters because they contain concessions beyond his jurisdiction, and to reject as spurious the letters of Alexander IV. and Clement IV., because the later of these, although almost word for word the same, takes no notice of that of Alexander IV., while both are equally silent respecting the donation of the Emperor Frederic (vol. iii. p. 108.). There may in such case have been a sufficient motive for silence, while unfortunately the experience of centuries will show the folly of questioning the genuineness of pontifical letters solely because they sin against the first principles of Christian charity.

But we cannot close our brief notice of these volumes without calling attention to the most singular and characteristic papers contained in them,—the pleadings, namely, of the Polish advocate before the Council of Constance (vol. iii. p. 66, &c.). The vehemence with which the writer appeals to abstract principles of ethics in matters wherein he must have felt that his own side was almost as much in the wrong as the other, will perhaps excite a smile. There is an affectation of guileless simplicity in the ascription of the purest motives to the coun-

cillors of Constance; and the cogency of some part of the reasoning is ludicrously in contrast with the marvellous absurdity of the rest. His pages are garnished with abundant references to Aristotle and Cicero, Thomas Aquinas, and the four Gospels. We cannot do justice to the wonderful chain of syllogisms, of which, however, we translate a few for the benefit of those who may not care to peruse the pages of the original Latin. First: the Knights are proved to be no Knights (vol. iii. p. 71.), for they were instituted as the brethren of St. Mary's Hospital at Acre, and by their removal from Palestine they have ceased to be such; and their hospital of St. Mary in Jerusalem never existed except in imagination. Again: they are not the same Order, because things of the same species agree in substance, and those which so agree produce the same effect; whereas these are concerned with camps, not with hospitals. Nor are they a religious Order, because a hospital was the final cause of their institution; and as the hospital is gone, so is also their religious profession. Again: by calling themselves hospitallers when they are not, their profession of religion is a falsehood, and such falsehood is hypocrisy: the Knights, therefore, are hypocrites. (P. 77.) Yet more: a state of religion is a certain school, wherein one is exercised to the perfection of charity: but the Knights are enrolled avowedly for purposes of robbery and murder; and as their life tends rather to perfection in cruelty than in charity (a state repugnant to the love of God and our neighbour, and to the evangelic verity), their state is plainly one not of religion, but of error; and as nothing is opposed to charity but mortal sin, therefore the Order itself consists fundamentally in mortal sin. (P. 84.) Logical sequence brings them to admit that Jews and Saracens are our neighbours, to be converted by all lawful means, but not to be plundered or deprived of their territories. Not only, however, are the Knights liars and hypocrites, they are also heretics; because heresy is by Thomas Aquinas defined to be division from the common faith, which is identified with charity: and as the objects of the Order involve violence, rapine, sedition, and homicide (which are opposed to charity,) therefore the Order is a heresy. Nay, they are worse than Jews and Turks, because all heretics professedly Christians are worse than the Turks, who have never received the Gospel, and even than the Jews, who have received only a figure of it in the Old Testament. They are even worse than all other heretics,—worse, if possible, than the Donatists, because if their heresy had spread, according to Gratian, over all Africa, and done grievous damage to the

Church, the Teutonic heresy has done more and poisoned for a longer time the faith of Christendom. It has lured its mercenaries to the destruction of their souls from Italy and France, from England and all Germany. It is worse than other heresies, because it rebels not only against the law of God, but also against that of nature. It is worse, because they annually carry fire and sword among the heathen on the two great feasts of the blessed Virgin in her especial honour, and because they sin against the Canons of the Council of Toledo, which says that no man is to be saved against his will. It is therefore obstinacy, presumption, and madness to profess openly, as they do, that their Order was instituted for the extermination of the heathen, who are their neighbours, and for the plundering of their goods and lands.


This reasoning has a certain cogency, and the arguments are not altogether weak in their appeal to ethical and Christian laws. But the writer had not, probably, altogether forgotten that the hands of his own countrymen were not wholly pure from all this heinous iniquity, that their dukes and kings had assigned to the Teutonic Knights many a province which was not theirs to give, and granted them free leave to rob and plunder tribes whom they found it convenient to brand with the name of heathens and savages. Probably he may have remembered also the more orthodox crusade in which Simon de Montfort spread desolation over the pleasant regions of Provence. Possibly he may have read (if he ever came across the exploits of Henry II. and the Normans in Ireland) that other Popes besides Gregory IX. and Alexander IV. had given up a people, already Christians, as a prey to the sword of the invader.

The pleader expresses a devout hope that the Order may be utterly extirpated, or else sent back to tend the sick in an hospital. His prayer again brings up the contrast between this prosecution of the plunderers of Pomerania with that which had just extinguished the Order of the Temple in flames and blood. The motives of fear and hatred are the same: there are the same imputations of cruelty, falsehood, hypocrisy, and heresy, but not a trace of those foul and obscene slanders which render the processes against the Templars in France and England infamous and disgusting. Whether the comparative moderation of the Polish pleader might, under altered circumstances, have stooped to the same unworthy scandals, is a question which, for the sake of human nature, we do not care to answer. The condition of the two orders was different. The one was taken unawares, far from the scenes of its exploits and its greatness: the other stood on its

own ground amidst its victorious legions. Boundless wealth was supposed to be attainable by the annihilation of the one, cold and forbidding regions were alone to be recovered by the suppression of the other. It is no wonder that the Knights of the Temple perished by an infamous combination, while the last Grand Master of the Teutonic Order became the first of a long line of powerful princes and kings.

ART. IX. — *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTONY FROUDE, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. I.—IV. London: 1858.

IN undertaking to write the history of the period over which these volumes extend, Mr. Froude has enjoyed great advantages over previous historians. He has had the complete collection of State Papers of the reign of Henry VIII., edited, in eleven volumes, by Mr. Robert Lemon, under the authority of the Commission for publishing State Papers, the first five volumes of which only had been brought out when Dr. Lingard published his last edition. He has also had a large manuscript collection of copies of letters, minutes of council, theological tracts, parliamentary petitions, depositions upon trials, and miscellaneous communications upon the state of the country furnished by agents of the Government, all relating to the early years of the English Reformation, which was generously placed in his hands for the purposes of this work, by, Sir Francis Palgrave, who had discovered these documents in the course of his employment upon the public records. We are glad to be informed that, the part of Mr. Froude's work comprising the reign of Henry VIII. having been now completed, this collection will be given to the world. Mr. Froude also appears to have had illustrative documents placed at his command from other quarters, and to have appreciated the value of other authentic sources of information, which had been comparatively neglected by his predecessors. He writes under the auspices of a new school of historical composition, which requires effect to be produced not by brilliant rhetoric and imposing generalisation, but by minute accuracy of detail. This change in the mode of describing past characters and events, is analogous to the change from idealism to realism in painting. Pre-Raphaelitism, both of the pen and the brush, is a useful correction of a previous



morbid tendency, though it is itself liable, like all other movements, to exaggeration, and will probably be followed in time by a reaction; a reaction which, in the case of history, will be fostered by the necessary prolixity of minute historians, and the difficulty of reading a history of England (to say nothing of the history of other countries) in two or three hundred octavo volumes, amidst the conflicting claims of other departments of knowledge, and the pressing avocations of a busy world.

Mr. Froude has evidently a genuine love of historical research, which has led him to make the most of the increased copiousness of his materials; and the chapters of his book on the Protestants, on Ireland, on Scotland, on the Pilgrimage of Grace, and on the French War, as well as many minor portions of the work, are so much fuller than the accounts of the same subjects given by his predecessors, that they may be said to be additions to the history of England. The account of the Pilgrimage of Grace given by Lingard occupies five pages. The account of the same occurrences given by Mr. Froude occupies eighty-eight pages, and this space is almost entirely filled with graphic and, for the most part, interesting details. The details are selected with judgment and taste, and thrown into a vivid and striking form by the powers of a fine imagination.

The narrative moves slow; nor has Mr. Froude the rare gift of preserving the perfect unity of a great historical drama, amidst great complexity of events and frequent shiftings of the scenes. His history, to adopt a metaphor which he himself applies to a part of it, passes before us like a series of slides in a magic lantern, bright and glowing but not sufficiently connected. It is much, however, that the slides are bright and glowing; that highest form of narrative power in which he is deficient, has been vouchsafed to few masters of the historic art. The book is greatly overloaded with long quotations from State Papers; but this arises less from a fault of literary judgment, than from an exaggerated estimate of the historical and moral value of every thing that proceeded from the government of Henry VIII.

Of Mr. Froude's style of writing different opinions will be formed, according as the critic is satisfied with the highly composite and somewhat flaccid English of the present day, or desires more of the strength and sweetness of the Saxon element of our language; a question of taste which it is quite beyond our present purpose and limits to decide. But the praise of grace and perspicuity cannot be denied. As little can a doubt

be raised of the beauty of certain sentimental and poetical passages which are scattered, not too lavishly or inappropriately, through the work. We may mention, as instances, the passage on the connexion between the movements of the Reformation and the great astronomical and maritime discoveries of the day in vol. i. p. 31.; and that on the two armies of martyrs, Romanist and Protestant, drawn out for the heroic conflict of mutual endurance in vol. ii. p. 342. The first of these passages, indeed, is doubtful in fact, since the countrymen of Galileo and Columbus remained Roman Catholic; and the second is doubtful in sentiment, since the butchering by a persecutor of an unresisting victim, is occasioned by none of the necessities, and mitigated by none of the chivalry, of war: but the commendation which has been bestowed on both as pieces of fine writing, is well deserved. Nor must we omit to do a just homage to the descriptive power evinced in such scenes as the coronation of Anne Boleyn, the landing of the English army at Edinburgh, the sea-fight off St. Helens, some of the martyrdoms, and the assassination of Cardinal Beton. It is but a slight drawback from the merit of such pictures, that the imagination which produces them sometimes overstrains itself, and talks of an execution having taken place 'on that dreary November day,' and of a proclamation being posted 'on that hot Midsummer day,' when the first may, for all we know, have been a glorious autumn afternoon, and the second, a morning of unusual severity even in an English summer. Mr. Froude has a great command of beautiful imagery, which, as might be expected, occasionally runs a little wild. The tone of his writing is sometimes rather mawkish: we come to read history, not to sigh over it. But this, again, is the exaggeration of a genuine sensibility which lies at the root of a good deal of the excellency of his work. In style, as in sentiment, he often palpably imitates Mr. Carlyle; there are also decided traces of the literary influence of Dr. Newman, especially in the more poetical and in the more sophistical passages.

The extended religious experience and converse which Mr. Froude has gone through in the course of his devious theological career, has given him a great advantage in depicting the various shades of religious sentiment and the various phases of religious party. He can enter into the feelings of Romanists, Anglo-Catholics, Protestants, and Anabaptists, with equal sympathy, and portray them with equal grace. Religious conservatism, moderatism, and fanaticism, — he knows them and can forcibly depict them all. He understands the love which manifests itself towards an erring brother in the charities of perse-

cution. He can enter fully into the attractions of religious submission, and he can enter as fully into the attractions of religious insurrection. He has studied every fold of the clerical character, and knows the odium theologicum in all its manifestations. We doubt whether, in this great qualification for portraying the phases of a complicated, various, and wavering religious movement, he has ever had a superior among historians. But Mr. Froude does not possess the same advantages in dealing with questions of politics, jurisprudence, or political economy, as in dealing with questions of religious sentiment.

Of his political reasoning the following is a fair specimen. He is justifying the use of the Test of Supremacy, with a view to the judicial murder of Fisher and More : —

‘In the present happy condition of this country even liberty of insurrection might be entertained as a private opinion, and might be maintained publicly as an abstract principle, without danger. But within a very few years we have seen a law passed, which made the assertion of such a liberty an act of felony ; and the circumstances of the year 1848 will enable us, if we reflect, not upon what these circumstances actually were, but on what they easily might have been, to understand the position of Henry VIII.'s government at the moment of the separation from Rome. If the danger in that year had ceased to be imaginary — if Ireland had broken into a real insurrection — if half the population of England had been socialist, and had been in secret league with the leaders of the revolution in Paris for a combined attack upon the State by insurrection and invasion — the mere passing of a law, making the use of seditious language an act of treason, would not have been adequate to the danger. Suspected persons would have been justly submitted to questions on their allegiance, and insufficient answers would have been interpreted as justifying suspicion. Not the expression only of opinions subversive of society, but the holding such opinions however discovered, would have been regarded and treated as a crime with the full consent of what is called the common sense and educated judgment of the nation.’

It is a singular fact that, in a country where so much political discussion goes on as in England, a highly educated man should be living under the impression that the imposition of tests of political opinion, to be taken under penalty of death, is a measure to which our statesmen would feel themselves at liberty to resort, and in resorting to which they would be supported by the common sense and educated judgment of the nation. We need hardly say that all the circumstances of Mr. Froude's hypothesis actually existed or were fully believed by the Tory Government to exist at the commencement of the revolutionary war ; but the Tories, though ready to adopt

the most extreme measures that panic could suggest, or that bigotry would sanction, did not consider it competent for them to put a Tory test to the Whigs, and send to the scaffold those who declined to take it. We profess ourselves at a loss to divine what the measure is, which has taken in Mr. Froude's imagination the shape of an Act making it felony to assert the liberty of insurrection as an abstract principle.

It is difficult to believe that Mr. Froude has ever seen the face of English justice. If he had, it would scarcely be possible for him to give such an account as he has given of the trials of Fisher and More. He says of Cromwell that, 'in fairness he should have been tried; but it would have added nothing to his chances of escape; he could not disprove the accusations.' It appears never to have occurred to him that a fair trial is the only mode of ascertaining whether the accused person can disprove the accusations or not, and, consequently, the only judicial evidence that history can accept of their truth or falsehood. A conviction on the unsupported evidence of the counsel for the Crown seems to him a perfectly conclusive, though harsh, mode of condemnation. Indeed, to assume that guilt is sometimes so great as to require no evidence, is a pervading habit of his mind, which we need hardly say a month's observation of the conduct of judicial investigations in a court of law would have totally dispelled. When he has enumerated a list of trumpety absurdities which 'must have been symptoms of an animus to the Crown prosecutors,' he regards 'the case for the prosecution' as 'complete.' *Whether the extremity of suspicion was justified is of little importance.* Enough had 'been proved to bring Surrey under the letter of the treason law, and to make him, far more than guilty under the spirit of it,' is a very fair specimen of his judicial language. Of the same body of evidence he prettily observes, that 'truth and falsehood, suspicion and certainty, gathered up into one black ominous storm.' The most tainted witness is good enough to convict a 'traitor' to Henry's infallibility, if 'the pressure of the times' makes a conviction useful. Indeed, the most romantic girl is not less exacting in her demands of proof against the enemies of her lover than he is against any of the objects of Henry VIII.'s anger or suspicion. In reference to questions of general jurisprudence, he is as free from the restraints of ordinary principles as he is in reference to questions of judicial investigation. 'A chasm lay between the two estimates of the same subject, which would not readily be filled,' is his way of justifying a breach of faith on the part of the government towards amnestied rebels. In another

case, the question being whether the Government is bound by the terms of a surrender made to the Viceroy of Ireland, he seems to think this question not ill solved by keeping the person who had surrendered for some time in prison previous to putting him to death. No doubt in all this he is led astray by his prepossessions as much as by his want of familiarity with legal principles; but it is impossible not to draw the inference that some knowledge of law and law courts is a useful accomplishment for an historian who is to form judgments upon questions of criminal justice.

With regard to Mr. Froude's notions of political economy, it is perhaps sufficient to say, that he evidently believes it possible to make food, and other articles of commerce, cheap by legislative regulations; that he assumes the era of protective and sumptuary legislation to be separated from us by so vast a chasm of time and thought, that we can no longer understand the views and motives upon which the authors of such legislation proceeded; and that he represents the debasement of the currency in 1546 as 'a temporary loan from the Mint, and a proceeding not distinguishable, except in form, from the suspension of specie payments in 1797.' The last-mentioned opinion reveals a want of knowledge of history beyond the period with which the writer is immediately concerned, which betrays itself elsewhere, and especially in his account of the feudal system. An acquaintance with the repeated struggles between mediæval sovereigns and their subjects about the debasement of the currency must surely have enlightened even the most romantic and prejudiced mind as to the true nature of the proceeding of Henry VIII.

But, unfortunately, the great merits of Mr. Froude's work are defaced by a still graver defect than any mere want of special knowledge, and one which, unless he has the courage to eradicate it, will probably convert into a mere quarry for future historians that which might have been an enduring edifice of his own fame. This defect is a pervading paradox of the most extravagant kind.

When the learned but insane Hardouin was taken to task for his paradoxical theory respecting the authorship of the Classics, he answered, that he did not get up at four o'clock every morning merely to say what others had said before him. In the same way Mr. Froude seems to have thought that it would be an unsatisfactory result of all his laborious researches, if they ended in furnishing him merely with a mass of new and interesting details, illustrating the received view of the occurrences of the time, or even with some important modifications of

that view in regard to questions of a secondary kind. Some great discovery must be made to reward adequately so much labour, and to satisfy the expectation raised by the opening of mines of documentary evidence hitherto unexplored. This discovery is, that the reign of Henry VIII. is a 'palimpsest,' the original writing of which being restored by Mr. Froude, who has detected it beneath the legends written over it by calumny and prejudice, Henry VIII., though his administration was beset with difficulties and clouded by domestic infelicity, comes forth as a perfect king, while his supposed victims are converted into criminals, whom the best of sovereigns was compelled, by their misdeeds, and by the urgent pressure of circumstances, to sacrifice to his sense of public duty.

The present tendencies of Mr. Froude's philosophy probably conspired with the fascinations of literary paradox in inducing him to adopt the imperious Tudor as the almost faultless hero of his history. Henry VIII., whatever may have been the detractions from this moral perfection of his character, was not deficient in force; and force is evidently the present object of Mr. Froude's sentimental admiration. By a most natural reaction the author of 'The Nemesis of Faith' and 'The Shadows of the Clouds' has now embraced 'muscular Christianity,' combined with the 'Hero Worship' of Mr. Carlyle, whose influence, as we have before mentioned, is visible in his reflections and in his style. Approaching the history of the English Reformation in this temper of mind, he could scarcely fail to be captivated by the strong will, the forcible language, and the vigorous administration of the second Tudor. He states, and we have no doubt with perfect accuracy, that 'when he commenced the examination of the records, he brought with him the inherited impression, from which he had neither any thought nor any expectation that he should be disabused.' He found, however, that this impression 'melted between his hands.' It has melted so completely, that there is scarcely one of Henry's actions, — persecutions, confiscations, multiplied acts of attainder, divorces, assumptions by the Crown of dominion over conscience, violent and sanguinary revolutions of policy, bloody vagrancy laws, breaches of amnesty, inroads upon the constitution, benevolences, repudiations of loans, debasings of the currency, diplomatic assassinations, — which does not come out laudable to masculine and comprehensive minds. The restoration of a palimpsest is a very feeble image whereby to depict a discovery unequalled in the annals of historical research. To render the illustration adequate, we must suppose the writing over the palimpsest to be an account of the same

matter exactly contradicting that which was given by the palimpsest itself.

The palimpsest commences with a view, reversing all our former views, of the state of society under the feudal system; for the feudal system it is, though the familiar features are almost lost under the roseate haze of sentiment, and the familiar name is scarcely breathed. The materials for this portion of the restoration, however, are not Mr. Robert Lemon's newly published State Papers, nor Sir Francis Palgrave's 'neglected manuscripts fast perishing of decay.' They are the Statutes of the Realm, a source of information not very 'imperfectly known,' as regards the Constitution and the law, to Mr. Reeves and Mr. Hallam, nor, as regards social and economical legislation, to Mr. Eden and Adam Smith — to say nothing of Barrington on the Statutes and Cobbett's Parliamentary History. 'There are times,' says Mr. Froude, pensively, 'in which I think that more which is really valuable in English history lies in these unobtrusive statutes, than in all our noisy wars, reformations, and revolutions.' He will find that Adam Smith has some remarks on that very attempt to do battle against the 'manifestations of the devil's power,' by means of sumptuary laws, which he is here lauding above Agincourt, the Constitution, and the Liturgy; remarks which seem almost pointed at the sumptuary hero of all the pageants and jousts recounted, by Hall, and of that crowning act of Henry VIII's sumptuary conflict with the devil — the Field of the Cloth of Gold. But if the statutes and the other records of feudalism have not been imperfectly known, they have certainly been 'misinterpreted through natural prejudice,' in an extraordinary degree. For it seems the social system established by William the Conqueror and his Normans, of which the Tudor era saw the lamentable but inevitable decay, was the system of a time 'when the nation was in a normal condition of militancy against social injustice; when the government was enabled by happy circumstances to pursue into detail a single and serious aim at the well-being — well-being in its widest sense — of all the members of the commonwealth. Villenage was a coherence of society on principles of fidelity,' when 'men were held together by oaths, free acknowledgments, and reciprocal obligations,' and the fealty of the villain 'was treated rather as a free promise to be given than as a thing to be compelled, and the dignity of the man was preserved even while acknowledging the obligations of his service.' The Norman Forest Laws served only to enhance the excitement of field sports by danger to the Saxon sportsman; indeed, it is the merry rogues who were hanged

and mutilated under those laws, if anybody, that stand in need of a playful apology to pedants for the immoral fun which they enjoyed. The statesmen of the day had attentively considered the subject of population, and found it better that it should remain stationary; a result which was secured by the beneficent agency of the Wars of the Roses and the Black Death. The feudal legislators, who fixed the price of herrings, without regard to the season and the wages of labour without reference to the price of bread, and who prohibited money from being carried out of the country in trade, while they exported it by millions for filibustering wars, were not ignorant of political economy; but they set its base and selfish laws aside in their aspirations after a high moral ideal. So high was that ideal that it is absolutely beyond our conception in this degenerate age, which has nothing to connect it with the corn laws passed out of anxiety for the British 'farmers and labourers' by the landlord legislators of Edward IV., except the faint links of sympathy preserved by the sepulchral monuments and the sound of the church bells. The attempts of the feudal Parliament to force traders and victuallers to sell their goods under price to the households of persons of quality, were a noble rebuke to the 'greedy and covetous' minds of persons in trade. The laws of apparel were not passed to prevent roturiers from dressing like their feudal betters, but to hold every man at his post in the happy social army, pending the great struggle of the Reformation. The life of the country gentlemen was a laborious course of public duty with scanty remuneration; and the nobility set an honourable example of economy and self-denial, by keeping enormous trains of riotous retainers, instead of opera-boxes and yachts. The Acts against enclosures (which Mr. Froude seems not to be aware were the subjects of contemporary discussion) were intended not merely to keep up the military services and aids, but to put down selfishness in the exercise of the rights of property, and prevent people from taking a 'commercial' view of the ownership of land. The trade monopolies of the guilds were not granted for the interests of the members of those guilds, or even for the encouragement of trade in the ordinary sense, but in order that the legislature, 'might not let that indispensable task go wholly unattempted of distributing the various functions of society by the rule of capacity.' Everybody, in those days, was almost as great a dramatic genius as Shakspeare, except, unluckily, those who attempted to rival him in writing dramas. A multitude of Acts, often reiterated, against fraud in various departments of commerce, prove that then indeed there was honest dealing between man and man. The universal

hatred of idleness is in like manner demonstrated by the bloody vagrancy laws. Two of those laws providing for the flogging of men *and women* till their backs are bloody — the flogging of 'impotent' persons, — branding, mutilating, and hanging for the third offence — and for the delivering to strange masters, and, in case of resistance, publicly flogging children *above five*, — are of peculiar interest, because 'the merit of them, 'or the guilt, if guilt there be,' belongs to Henry's own royal hand. We apprehend that to the true hero-worshipper the 'guilt' of an act of oppression is, if not its 'merit,' at least its fascination. What enhances the virtue of the rulers of the State and the laity in this heroic age is, that all the time the Rulers of the Church and the clergy, who should be the salt of society, had not only lost their savour but become absolute poison.

The most important discoveries of this part of the 'palest' are two respecting the Statutes of Labourers. The ordinary opinion is that the labouring population having been thinned by the great plague in the reign of Edward III., and the wages of labour having risen accordingly, a statute was passed by the feudal landowners in the interest of the employer, to prohibit the labourer, under penalties, from taking advantage of the state of the market, and to compel him to serve, upon demand, at the old rate of wages; and that this statute was followed by a line of similar statutes, as well as by other statutes passed in the same interest to restrain the children of agricultural labourers from being apprenticed to trades, and thereby withdrawing their labour from the land. This view of the matter was countenanced by the express words of the legislators, who, to do them justice, were no sentimentalists, and who avowed their *perpetual* and generous object in the plainest terms which the English language could supply. It was also countenanced by the oaths and the heavy and increasing penalties by which it was attempted to bind the reluctant labourer to regulations which, if they had been made in his interest, not in the interest of the employer, he would have observed, or rather have enforced on the employer, of his own accord. And it was further countenanced by the clauses which provide, that where the customary rate of wages is already below the maximum fixed by the statute, the customary rate, and no higher, shall continue to be taken, the statute notwithstanding. The germs of the bloody Vagrancy Laws, in which Mr. Froude takes such austere delight, are found in the same statutes, and lead to the suspicion that the Vagrancy Laws, the Statutes of Labourers, and the Acts restraining Apprenticeship, were all parts of a great legislative effort

of the feudal landlords to prevent the labourer from carrying his labour to a free market in the rising towns and bind him down again to the feudal soil. In Mr. Froude's 'palimpsest,' however, this is all entirely reversed; and the Statutes of Labourers, instead of being selfish attempts of the feudal Parliaments to lower the labourers' wages in their own interest, turn out to have been, in fact, most disinterested ordinances passed by those philanthropic rulers for the purpose of raising the labourers' wages against themselves. The penalties imposed on the labourer for nonobservance of the statutes, and his evident efforts to escape from them, must, we presume, be explained by reference to the Quixotic public spirit of both parties; the patriot labourer endeavouring to renounce the boon which the patriot landowner was determined to bestow. The insurrection of Wat Tyler and his fellows, of the German peasants, and of the French Jacques, against the whole of a social system which was formed and maintained for their especial benefit, will admit of a similar explanation. The statutes restraining the agricultural poor from putting their sons to trade, may be said to show the anxiety of the legislative sage, lest the enterprising Rasselas of the feudal manor should, in an evil hour for himself, quit the Happy Valley of Villenage, stray to the selfish commercial town, and plunging into the 'unequal struggle with capital,' the natural enemy of labour, fail for want of feudal protection in that hopeless conflict, and sink into a Whittington. The statutes or clauses of statutes, lengthening the hours of work and cutting off holidays, must have been wrung by the conscientious labourer from the reluctant bosom of his too-indulgent lord.

The second discovery relates to the rate of wages fixed by the Statutes of Labourers, and has been so fully discussed by a contemporary*, that we need only glance at it here. The statutes give the labourer his choice between two scales of wages, one daily, the other by the year. The daily scale for a farm servant, by 6 Henry VIII. c. 3., is 4*d.* for half the year, and 3*d.* for the other half. The yearly scale is 16*s.* 8*d.*, with 4*s.* for clothes, and a personal allowance for food, which, from documents quoted by Mr. Eden, (vol. i. p. 46.) appears to have been of a very coarse kind, and which the contemporary to whom we have alluded values at 10*s.*, but which, to be safe, we will value at 15*s.* a year. It seems obvious that the yearly and daily scale being offered as alternatives, check each other, and that in the then low state of agriculture the labourer could only

* See the British Quarterly Review for last April.

get as many days' work in the year as would make up his yearly earnings to about 35s. According to Mr. Froude's 'palimpsest,' however, the labourer could command an engagement for the year at the daily rate, which is made up to 4d. a day on the average all the year round by a conjectural addition for harvest work; though, we may remark, artificers were specially compelled by Statute (12 Richard II.) to work on the farms in harvest in order to keep down the price of labour at that season. And thus his wages are raised from 36s. to 5*l.* a year, considerably more than the rent of a farm on which six labourers were kept, and a quarter of the income of a justice of the peace, as stated respectively in Mr. Froude's own pages. From these wages the happy peasant who could command them was perpetually trying to escape, and was imprisoned, stocked, and branded for so doing.

The decline of the commercial part of this admirable system must, it seems, be connected with the deep melancholy which settled down on Queen Elizabeth in her later years. Why so admirable a system went to decay under so admirable a sovereign, just at the moment when the nation exchanged a false for a true religion, it is a little difficult to discern from the 'palimpsest.' The discovery of America and of the correct theory of the solar system does not seem to us an adequate, or even a rational, account of the matter. The complication and fluctuation of employment and population, also seems as insufficient to explain such a relapse, on the part of an heroic nation, from a high ideal to the consecration of absolute 'baseness,' as the rule of social life. There is something, perhaps, nearer the mark, in the hint that a deficiency was ultimately found of men honest enough to regulate other people's interests without looking to their own; though it is curious that this should have occurred at the very moment when Mr. Froude celebrates the opening of a new and glorious era. Why should people have grown less trustworthy and lower in their views of social obligation, in the same proportion as they grew more sincerely and rationally religious? Perhaps, after all, the safest explanation is that it was 'inevitable.' We may set all cross-questioning at defiance so long as we hold the spigot of destiny and can turn upon the importunate querist the overwhelming tide of fate.

Here perhaps would have been the place to tell us something definite about the political constitution of England under the Tudors. What was the composition and character of the two Houses of Parliament, and how far were they independent of the Crown? We should also have been glad to know what

the Judges and Juries were like, and how justice was done between the Crown and the subject. About judges and juries we do not remember that we get a single syllable of information through the whole course of these pages. About the Constitution we get scattered hints, and those of a rather contradictory kind. In one case we are told that the 'despotism' of Henry was 'splendidly veiled when he could applaud so resolved an assertion of the liberties of the House of Commons' (it is only the assertion of their personal privilege of freedom from arrest, in the Ferrars' case), and could acknowledge that 'any portion of his own power was dependent on their presence and their aid' (vol. iv. p. 151.). But in Lambert's case (iii. 340.) the Crown seems so completely bound by the law that it cannot, even in the most touching circumstances, exercise the prerogative of mercy. When a butcherly vagrancy law has been twice 'formally passed' by Parliament, it becomes 'the expressed conviction of the English nation' (i. 78.). But in iii. 375. (where some very instructive details are given respecting the general election of 1539), we are told that 'the returns for the boroughs were determined by the chief owners of property within the limits of the franchise; those for the counties depended on the great landholders,' which, in a case of vagrancy laws especially, would make the voice of Parliament something considerably short of the 'expressed conviction of the English nation.' We want to know who really originates persecuting acts, confiscations, repudiations, acts of attainder, and recommendations to a beloved sovereign to marry again the day after cutting off his wife's head; and whether the verdict of the jury in a case of treason is good for any thing as evidence of the guilt of the prisoner? There is a great disposition on the part of the writer of the 'palimpsest' to fix questionable transactions on the Parliament and the nation; but his language is far from explicit. The seat of responsibility appears to be placed behind a mysterious cloud, where the force of circumstances gathers, breaking forth from time to time in an inevitable demand for somebody's money or head.

It is rather fortunate that the 'palimpsest' begins with the fall of Wolsey, and not at the commencement of Henry's reign. The author is thus spared the necessity of contrasting the Defender of the Papal Supremacy and the assailant of Luther, with the framer of the test of the Royal Supremacy, and the bloody persecutor of Haughton, Fisher, and More. The review of the early years of the king is done with a very delicate hand. It appears, however, that Henry was throwing himself into the Roman Catholic system, indulgences and all, like a Newmanite

throwing himself into the system of the Church of England as a spiritual experiment; but that about the time when he wished to get rid of his wife, and the Pope refused to help him, he found that the fatal hour had struck and that the Church of Hildebrand could not be restored. The eye of the author of the 'palimpsest,' however, saw the Pope's enemy in the 'Defender of the Faith,' from the beginning. 'It is certain that if, as I said, he had died before the divorce was mooted, Henry VIII., like that Roman emperor said by Tacitus to have been *consensu omnium dignus imperii nisi imperasset*, would have been considered by posterity as formed by Providence for the conduct of the Reformation. We must allow him, therefore, the benefit of his past career, and be careful to remember it when interpreting his later actions.' But the historian himself does not remember Henry's past career, or allow him the benefit of it when he is cutting off the heads of More and Fisher for continuing to believe the doctrines which he had himself vehemently defended.

In the case of the divorce of Catherine of Arragon (where Mr. Froude at once shows his superiority to his predecessors in documentary illustration and fulness of discussion) the writer of the 'palimpsest' takes the king's side as vehemently as if he had stood in the shoes of Anne Boleyn; but, by a bold and unexpected stroke, entirely alters the king's plea. The king applied to the Pope to have his marriage with Catherine declared null, on the theological and canonical ground of the invalidity of the dispensation under which that marriage had been contracted. This was the question laid before the Universities, and if it had not been also the question before the Pope, the opinions of those bodies would have been quite irrelevant. The alleged danger to the succession from the want of an heir male to the Crown was urged only as a ground for claiming speedy judgment. Mr. Froude, however, proposes to discard the theological plea and transfer the case to the broad and intelligible ground of political necessity. He wishes 'the theological labyrinth had never been entered,' and even that the monarch whose admirable theological productions he is afterwards to celebrate, had never received a theological education. No doubt the theological plea was most unsound and hypocritical. Whether the original dispensation to marry Arthur's widow was good or bad, twenty years of cohabitation with Catherine, and the birth of several children, one of whom was still living and had been brought up as a legitimate child, had made the marriage a good marriage in the sight of God; and to do what Mr. Froude admits was a cruel though 'necessary' (i. e. convenient) injustice

to Catherine and bastardise her daughter on the theological ground, was to suppose that God abhors a technical flaw more than a substantial wrong. But still, to shift the ground of one of the greatest controversies (as well as the very filthiest) that ever agitated Christendom, at this distance of time, is a ticklish operation, even for the most skilful advocate. It is like Dr. Newman's attempt to transfer the time-worn edifice of Romanism from the old foundation of Tradition to the new foundation of Development. Mr. Froude is under the impression that the Pope was the depository of a general dispensing power which would have enabled him to divorce Henry from Catherine, and permit the King to marry again, and that a *causa urgentissima* had arisen for the exercise of this power, that *causa urgentissima* being the paramount interest of the English nation in having an heir to the throne. But this impression is a complete mistake. The Pope may declare a marriage null on canonical grounds, and this power was very grossly abused about the time of Henry VIII., in favour of parties who wished to be released from marriages, and who alleged technical pre-contracts or factitious consanguinity. But the Pope, though he may declare a marriage null on frivolous canonical grounds, has no power to divorce parties canonically married, even for the most urgent reasons of expediency. Marriage, in the Roman Catholic Church, is a sacrament, which is in its nature indelible; and a man can no more be unmarried than he can be unbaptized. Mr. Froude, therefore, in abandoning the theological and canonical ground, has abandoned the only ground the king had to stand on. At the same time he inadvertently justifies the Pope, who, if the only plea before him was a sham plea, might be pardoned for dealing with it as sham; and, who, if political expediency was the point on which the question really turned, was no more bound to consult the political interests of England than those of his own States and Italy in general, then lying at the mercy of Catherine's nephew, Charles. We cannot help thinking that if Mr. Froude had been writing in those days, and had broached his present opinions in 'the king's great matter,' deploring 'that the theological labyrinth had been entered,' and that his Highness had received a theological education, he would have been considered to have 'lost his way in the world,' and to be 'unable or unwilling to recover it,' and that he would consequently have 'been dismissed out of it' by a process of heroic succinctness.

The king's plea was conscience, and the hazard to his eternal salvation. But his conscience was so constructed that it could be comforted only by a decision of the question on that which

it might have been supposed was the least comfortable side. Those agonies of a tortured mind, which revealed themselves about this period in perpetual joustings, feastings, and masqueradings, could be assuaged by nothing but a decision that his wife was a harlot and his daughter a bastard, and that his own life had been one long incest. To procure this soothing unction he, as Mr. Froude admits, bribed, cozened, and intimidated without limit. The plea of counter-intimidation and counter-corruption on the part of the imperialists may hold in regard to the Italian universities, but it will not hold with regard to the German universities, or with regard to Paris, where the government influence was all on Henry's side. Much less will it hold with regard to Oxford and Cambridge. The plea of the universal prostitution of ecclesiastics, which Mr. Froude urges with so much zest, is rebutted by the fact that his Highness had to undertake the graceful task of interfering personally at Oxford to bully the university into declaring his marriage an incest. Cambridge was more 'open' and 'manly,' and voting black white, 'escaped direct humiliation.' We presume, therefore, that Dr. Buckmaster, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, was speaking only of *indirect* humiliation when he said, as recorded in Mr. Froude's pages, 'All the world almost, crieth out of Cambridge for this act, and specially of me.' At Oxford the old heads and doctors 'found no difficulty in 'submitting their consciences to State dictation.' The young masters made a vigorous stand, not perceiving, through their want of experience and statesmanship, how much a decision notoriously unconscientious and corrupt would tend to convince Europe, and settle the interests of the kingdom.

'These admonitory clauses (of the king's letter to the university) were sufficiently clear: they were scarcely needed, however, by the older members of the university. An enlarged experience of the world, which years at Oxford as well as elsewhere do not fail to bring with them, a just appreciation of the condition of the kingdom, and a sense of the obligations of subjects in times of political difficulty, sufficed to reconcile the heads of the college to obedience; and threats were not required where it is unlikely that a thought of hesitation was entertained. But there was a class of residents which appears to be perennial in that university, composed out of the younger masters; a class which, defective alike in age, in wisdom or in knowledge, was distinguished by a species of theoretic high church fanaticism; and which, until it received its natural correction from advancing years, required from time to time to be protected against its own extravagance by some form of external pressure. These were the persons whom the king was addressing in his more severe language, and it was not without reason that he had recourse to it.'

It so happens that the tendency of the young Oxford masters at this period was not to High Churchmanship but to Lutheranism, as may partly be gathered from Mr. Froude's own pages; and they were united, to the honour of Protestantism, with the Lutherans of Germany in opposition to the divorce. But this does not diminish our enjoyment of this skilful attempt by a historian, who was not many years ago figuring as an extreme Tractarian writer, to influence the reader in an historical question by an appeal to the popular dislike of the Tractarian party. This is 'rising on stepping-stones of your dead self to 'higher things' with a vengeance. But the former self of Mr. Froude is not quite so dead as he may imagine: we none of us quite get rid of the traces of what we have once been. He owes to his old teachers a good deal of his method of reasoning — his command of ambiguous language — his dexterity in deodorising, as it were, transactions of which the moral scent is not very sweet, and his faculty of lubricating 'painful' circumstances so as to make them slide easily down the throat of the reader. If he no longer 'sublimates absurdities with mysteries,' he has not lost the kindred act of sublimating fraud and wrong into a grander kind of honesty and justice. And the strong taste for self-prostration before some infallible idol, which belongs to his original party, blends with and heightens the hero-worship of Mr. Carlyle in the historical adorer of Henry VIII. In the passage from which we just quoted and elsewhere the late writer of sentimental and heterodox romances is a little hard upon the more sentimental and enthusiastic part of the world.

At the period of Campeggio's arrival in England the people of London (not anticipating the 'palimpsest' theory of the universal sympathy of the nation with the king) were crying foul play. To allay the popular feeling, the king summoned an assembly which was attended by the nobility and other persons of note, at the Palace of Bridewell; and he there solemnly protested that he was led to part with Catherine only by fear for his eternal salvation; that he parted with her with regret; that he was perfectly happy with her, and that if he were to marry again he would choose her before any other woman. This is stated by Hall, the best authority, who gives the king's oration at some length. But both this scene and the famous scene before the legates, in which, according to Holinshed, as well as according to Shakspeare, Henry repeated the same asseverations, entirely disappear from Mr. Froude's narrative, which tells us nothing of what occurred upon Campeggio's arrival in England.

We do not know whether Mr. Froude has any reason to

question the genuineness of the collection of letters from Henry to Anne Boleyn, given in the Appendix to Hearne's Avesbury, but he makes no allusion to any thing contained in it.* In one of these letters the king expresses his pious hope, that Campeggio, *then on his way to England*, 'will help him to that which he has so long longed for, to God's pleasure, and to both their 'comforts.' This, contrasted with the subsequent declaration before the assembly at Bridewell and before the two legates which we have just mentioned; proves pretty well what the king's word and honour were worth, besides appearing to throw back the date of the amour with Anne to a period rather inconvenient for the palimpsest theory. In another of the letters Henry throws some light on the sincerity of his theological scruples, by telling Anne that he has been at work for four hours at the treatise in which these scruples were expounded, and then proceeding to relieve his agonised conscience, and cultivate that delicacy which Mr. Froude finds so much wanting in the mind of his intended wife, by expressing his love for her in terms which a pot-boy might utter, but would scarcely write to the object of his amours.

Mr. Froude is 'persuaded' that Henry's 'discomforts' with Catherine (that is, we presume, his desire to get rid of her,) did not arise from a latent inclination for any other woman. The earliest mooted of the subject of the divorce which he can find is in June, 1527. In Cavendish's contemporary biography of Wolsey, there is a long and circumstantial account of the interference of Wolsey, and afterwards of Lord Northumberland, by the desire and in the name of the king, to break off Lord Percy's engagement with Anne Boleyn. This is mentioned by Cavendish as the first manifestation of the king's love for Anne. The occurrence is not dated, but it must have happened not later than 1523, for before the end of that year Lord Percy was engaged to be married to a daughter of Lord Shrewsbury, and Cavendish tells us that this engagement was contrived expressly to break off Lord Percy's engagement with Anne.† Another circumstance in the story fixes its date before June, 1525; for at that period Sir Thomas Boleyn

* The originals appear to be in the somewhat suspicious keeping of the Vatican. But we are not aware that they were ever read, nor is the bulk of them capable of being read, on the Papal side of the controversy; and the letters bear the strongest internal marks of genuineness.

† It is not improbable, as Burnet observes, that Anne Boleyn's father, who was ambassador to France, brought her over with him from that country in 1522, when war was declared by Henry against Francis.

was made Viscount Rochford, and in the story Anne is disparaged by Wolsey as being only the daughter of a knight. Mr. Froude dubs the story 'romantic,' though he allows it is too circumstantial to have been invented, and says it 'is not without its difficulties.' But those difficulties are greatly softened (1), by not alluding to the story when the origin of the king's desire to be divorced from Catherine is in question, and (2), by omitting all mention of the King and Wolsey, and merely saying that, if Cavendish's account be true, the affair was 'ultimately interrupted by Lord Northumberland himself.'

Henry's ambassadors were instructed to state to the Pope that he had never been unfaithful to Catherine. Mr. Froude says, he had been unfaithful to her but in one instance, which he thinks a great thing for a king; the one instance being that of Elizabeth Blunt, the mother of the Duke of Richmond, the 'young Marcellus,' as he is gaily styled by Mr. Froude. One instance would be enough to dispel the hypothesis of extraordinary physical coldness to which Mr. Froude resorts in attempting to prove that the somewhat rapid succession of the king's marriage was occasioned not by licentiousness, but by an overwhelming sense of public duty subduing a strong natural disinclination to the married state. The supposed evidence of the disgusting fact of Henry's connexion with Anne Boleyn's sister, Mary, Mr. Froude has discussed in an essay appended to his fourth volume, and considers himself to have reduced it to mere clerical and treasonable scandal. In particular, his laborious researches at the Rolls have been rewarded, among other things, by the discovery that the charge was not laid before the king by Cardinal Pole, in his expostulatory letter, and suffered to pass unrefuted on Henry's side. Mr. Froude has found Pole's manuscript at the Rolls, and the charge is not contained in it. It was inserted in the treatise 'On the Unity of the Church,' published at Rome in the winter of 1538-9; so that all inferences from the king's tacit admission are at an end. Nor does the point appear ever to have been made against the king in the controversy respecting the divorce, when it would have told so heavily against him. The words '*ex quocunque licito vel illicito coitu*' in the draft proposed dispensation by the Pope for the marriage of the king with Anne Boleyn occur in an exhaustive catalogue of impediments to be dispensed with; and may well, as Mr. Froude argues, be taken as common form; though why a dispensation for the second marriage should be required if the first was null, and there was no canonical impediment to the second, is a very different question. It is singular that not only Mr. Froude, but all previous writers, should have overlooked

the apparently decisive proof of this disputed fact which presents itself in the principal documents connected with the question, and in the most obvious form. The statute 25 Henry VIII. c. 22., declaring the king's marriage with Catherine void and the separation good, and settling the succession to the Crown, contains a provision (sec. 3—5.) rendering unlawful (notwithstanding any dispensation) all marriages within the degrees of affinity prohibited by the law of God, including that of a brother's wife, and empowering the ordinary to terminate by separation any such marriages if already contracted. There can be no doubt that this provision, though ostensibly general, is inserted in the special Act with a view to the case of the king's marriage under a papal dispensation with Catherine, and the sentence of separation about to be pronounced by Cranmer. The Statute 28 Henry VIII. c. 7., declaring the marriage with Anne Boleyn void, and resettling the succession, extends the prohibition of the former Act to cases of affinity by carnal knowledge, and among others to the case of a man marrying his mistress's sister; and not only renders valid all future separations by the ordinary, of persons so named, but all past separations also, of which there could have been but one — that of the king from Anne Boleyn, which had just been pronounced by Cranmer. It seems undeniable that this enactment also, though ostensibly general like the other, is pointed at the particular marriage the dissolution of which the Act confirms; and that the mysterious allusion in the preamble to a ground of invalidity which is not specified, but which is stated to have been disclosed by Anne Boleyn to Cranmer, really refers to a disclosure by her of the king's previous connexion with her sister Mary. If what she disclosed was only a precontract with Lord Percy or any other person, why should there have been any more delicacy about specifying it in the Act than there afterwards was about specifying the pretended precontract with the Marquis of Lorraine, in the case of Anne of Cleves? In the eleventh of the love-letters of Henry to Anne Boleyn before their marriage, to which we have above referred, there occur the words, 'As touching your sister's matter, I have caused Walter Welsh to write to my lord my mind therein; whereby I trust that Eve shall not have power to deceive Adam; for surely whatsoever is said, cannot so stand with his honor, but that he must needs take his natural daughter now in her extreme necessity.' This, if the letters are genuine, tends to prove that Anne was cognisant of the connexion. From other persons it may very well have been kept a secret till it became necessary to disclose it in order to enable Cranmer to pronounce the sentence of separation; and

this affords a perfect explanation of the silence of the king's opponents on the subject during the controversy respecting the divorce, and of the non-appearance of the charge in the manuscript remonstrance addressed to the king by Reginald Pole. In his pardonable exultation at the discovery of the omission of the charge in Pole's manuscript at the Rolls, and at his supposed success in tracing the other evidence up to scandalous sources, Mr. Froude commits himself to the admission, that 'if Pole's fact is true, his conclusion from it is unanswerably just.' 'If,' he proceeds, 'Henry had really debauched Anne Boleyn's sister, his demand to the Pope for his divorce, and his arguments in urging it, were of amazing effrontery. His own and his minister's language in Parliament and in Convocation — the peremptory haughtiness with which he insisted to all foreign courts on "the justice of his cause," exhibit a hardy insolence without parallel in history. So monstrous appears his conduct, that it would be in vain to attempt to understand the character of the person who could be guilty of it, or of the Parliament and the clergy who consented to be his instruments. Persons so little scrupulous as, on this hypothesis, were both prince and people, could have discovered some less tortuous means of escaping from the difficulty of a wife.' We will not be so ungenerous as to hold Mr. Froude literally to a hypothetical admission, made in a moment of natural elation. But we are entitled to suggest that he should moderate, or at least prevent from overflowing into his marginal analysis and table of contents, the violence of his emotions against so eminent and, on the whole, good a man as Cardinal Pole. If Pole took part against Henry, it was clearly for conscience' sake and against his personal interests; so that his opinion cannot be dismissed with contempt as that of a 'refugee.' If he forgot, in religious partisanship, the ties of civil allegiance, so did all strong religious partisans of the day. And if he used hard language, hard language was the fashion with controversialists of those times, and not least with those who called the Pope 'the cankered and venomous serpent Paul, Bishop of Rome.' We beg to observe by the way that the 'people,' however convenient it may be to introduce them, had nothing whatever to do with the affair.

One scheme was to get Catherine into a cloister; and to this, though a mode of disposing of persons who have the misfortune to be 'obstacles' which is one of the most characteristic iniquities of the Romish system, Mr. Froude holds that Catherine, 'if she had thought first or chiefly of justice,' would have consented. He does not perceive that the dissolution of

monasteries, which he regards as so necessary and right, would have placed the 'obstacle' in the way again. Catherine, however, would not come into the scheme; her perception of the paramount claims of the national interest upon her consideration being, perhaps, somewhat obscured by the presence under the same roof, and in rival state, of the charming girl who the public service required should step into her shoes when she was gone. She refused to take the vow of chastity unless the king would take it too—a 'most unfortunate answer,' in Mr. Froude's opinion, to what others might call a most unfortunate request. Thereupon the 'chivalrous' king directed his agents at Rome to propose, as a way of solving the difficulty, that he should take the vow in order to induce Catherine to do the same, and that when she had done so, the Pope should 'clearly discharge' him, leaving her bound. Certainly this was the prince 'chosen by Providence to conduct the Reformation,' and abolish the iniquities of the Papal system. This frankness contrasts nobly with the duplicity of the Pope; and that conscience must have been tender indeed, and deeply wounded by the suspicion of a canonical flaw, which could lay to itself such balm. One marriage was to be dissolved on the ground that the Pope had no power to dispense with the law of God, which forbade a man to marry his brother's widow, and another was to be contracted in its place, on the faith of the Pope's power to dispense prospectively with the obligation of a solemn oath for purposes avowedly fraudulent, and to the cruel injury of another person, that person the perjurer's wife. Mr. Froude very candidly allows that this incident 'sadly indicates the devices of policy' into 'which in this unhappy business honourable men allowed themselves to be driven.' When people on the side opposed to Henry's wishes allow themselves to be 'driven into devices of policy' they cease to be honourable men. We presume it was the same over-mastering necessity that compelled Henry to lay a plot for entrapping into a French prison, under the false pledge of his kingly word, a dependent of Catherine whom he supposed to be moving as her agent in the matter of the divorce—a fact of which there seems sufficient evidence in Ellis's '*Original Letters*' (vol. i. p. 281. 1st series), but which is not found in the palimpsest restored by Mr. Froude. Between obscenity, fraud, and lying, we should have come to the conclusion that this 'dread lord' was 'a man like the rest of us,' even without being permitted, as we afterwards are, to see him in the more tender relations of life.

In the passage just alluded to a lingering Shadow of the Clouds falls on Henry's offences, veiling them from our irreverent

sight. It falls still more deeply when we are told that 'it would have been well for Henry VIII. if he had lived in a world in which women could have been dispensed with, so ill in all his relations with them he succeeded. With men he could speak the right word—he could do the right thing; with women he seemed under a fatal necessity of mistake.' It would have been well for Sir John Paul and his partners if they could have lived in a world where trust securities could have been dispensed with, so ill in all their relations with that description of property did they succeed. It would have been well for the late Mr. Palmer if he could have lived in a world without a Mr. Cooke, so unsuccessful was he in all his relations with that unfortunate gentleman. It would be well for pickpockets if they lived in a world where there were no pockets to pick. It would be well for us all if we lived in a world where the 'mistakes' to which we happen to be peculiarly liable could not possibly be committed. We will not pause to speculate on the social delights of a world of which King Henry VIII. should be the ruling spirit, and from which women should be excluded, lest they should interfere with that monarch's moral development. But to borrow an epithet which Mr. Froude elsewhere applies to the king in his relations with women, it would certainly be a very 'business-like' world.

Elsewhere we are told —

'The position which, in his wife's presence, he (Henry) assigned to another woman, however he may have persuaded himself that Catherine had no claim to be considered his wife, admits neither of excuse nor of palliation; and he ought never to have shared his throne with a person who consented to occupy that position. He was blind to the want of delicacy in Anne Boleyn, because, in spite of his chivalry, his graces, his accomplishments, in his relations with women he was without delicacy himself.'

It seems a considerable detraction from his 'chivalry' that he should 'be without delicacy in his relations with women;' and we cannot help thinking that the historian has for the moment caught something of the king's defect, when he endeavours, as he does in this and other passages, to shift the blame as much as possible from a young and intoxicated girl to her mature and royal seducer from the path of delicacy and right. However, he proceeds:—

'He (Henry) directed, or attempted to direct, his conduct by the broad rules of what he thought to be just. In the wide margin of uncertain ground where rules of action cannot be prescribed, and where men must guide themselves by consideration for the feelings of others, he, so far as women were concerned, was unfortunately a

stranger. Such consideration is a virtue which can be learned only in the society of equals, where necessity obliges men to practise it. Henry had been a king from his boyhood; he had been surrounded by courtiers who had anticipated all his desires; and exposed as he was to an ordeal from which no human being could have escaped uninjured, we have more cause, after all, to admire him for those excellences which he conquered for himself, than to blame the defects which remained to him.

The latter part of this paragraph, we submit, confirms the ordinary view that Henry was a tyrant, and gives, so far as it goes, a true explanation of the way in which his tyrannical character was formed. The first part enlarges the domain of casuistry. So far as we can see, a man who had beaten his wife (certainly not a greater outrage than was offered by Henry's 'chivalry' to Catherine) might plead, according to this moral code, that he was attempting to direct his conduct by the broad rules of what he thought to be just. Mr. Froude, as we have seen, finds great difficulty in understanding the character of a consummate hypocrite, and we own we find as much difficulty in understanding the character of a man who was something more than brutal in his conduct to every person of the sex of Catherine and Anne Boleyn, and something more than admirable in his conduct to every person of the sex of Wolsey, Cromwell, Fisher, and More.

The depths of self-deceit are always unfathomable; much less can history attempt, with any hope of success or profit, to fathom them across three hundred intervening years. Very likely Henry gave a fair picture of what he at least believed to be his own motives for wishing to put away a faithful wife and marry a woman he liked better, when he directed his envoy at Rome 'to say plainly to His Holiness that the king's desire and 'intent *convolare ad secundas nuptias non patitur negativum*; 'and whatsoever should be found of bull, brief, or otherwise, 'His Holiness found his conscience so disquieted, his succession 'in such danger, and his most royal person in such perplexity for 'such things unknown and not to be spoken, that other remedy 'there was not but His Grace to come by one way or other, 'and specially at his hands if might be, to the desired end, and 'that all concertation to the contrary should be vain and 'frustrate.' Mr. Froude, who plays hierophant to Henry's mind, as Mr. Carlyle does to that of Cromwell, says of the despatch of which this is a fair sample, that 'it is long and perplexed; 'the style that of a man who saw his end most clearly, and was 'vexed with the intricate and dishonest trifling with which his 'way was impeded, and which, nevertheless, he was struggling

‘to tolerate.’ The king has at least the frankness to put the desire of flying to a second marriage first in the list of motives. This was the motive which was strong enough to break through the decency which conscience would have observed towards the world and Catherine, and to override the dictates of policy which loudly required the second marriage to be postponed until the first had been annulled. This, therefore, not conscience or policy, was the ruling motive; and the ruling motive decides the character of the action. But if there was no justification for Henry, there was considerable excuse of a kind which his worshippers, if they take this high line, must be compelled to ignore. It was a profligate and Machiavellian age, when marriage were dissolved, and bigamy, under the name of re-marriage, permitted by the Church with unprincipled facility on the ground of sham precontracts or factitious consanguinity; and when ‘devices of policy,’ which in these days would shock a Russian diplomatist or a Neapolitan Minister of Police, were resorted to, without scruple, by all ordinary politicians. It was the age when Caesar Borgia and Louis XI. found eulogists as warm as the eulogist of Henry VIII. whom Mr. Froude quotes at the end of his last volume, and when the perjured and heartless Francis I. was considered the model of a king and a gentleman. Henry in asking the Pope to divorce him from his wife and authorise him to marry again, asked a corrupt tribunal for a corrupt favour, which would have been granted without the slightest hesitation, had not another, and at the moment, a more formidable interest, been arrayed on the other side. ‘And so first the great party of sedition began to shape itself, which for sixty years, except in the shortlived interlude of its triumph under Catherine’s daughter, held the nation on the edge of civil war,’ — these words of Mr. Froude, describing the immediate effect of the divorce, seem a sufficient answer to all pleas of national interest and the peace of the kingdom, and a sufficient comment on the wisdom of those who are wise above justice, truth, and honour.

The fall of Wolsey has hitherto been supposed to have been connected with the failure of that minister to effect the king’s object in the matter of the divorce; and this view seemed to be supported by the parallel of the fall of Cromwell, after the king’s disappointment in the personal attractions of the new queen whom that minister had selected. But no such connexion appears in Mr. Froude’s palimpsest. According to that document Wolsey was swept from the helm by an inevitable revolution in the policy of the country, in an anti-ecclesiastical

sense, which produced 'what in modern language we should describe as a change of ministry, the Government being transferred to an Opposition, who had been irritated by long despotism under the hands of men whom they despised, and who were borne into power by an irresistible force in a moment of excitement and danger.' The vile treatment of Wolsey after his fall 'is a stain which we have to lament in the conduct of the new administration:' not an instance of the ingratitude of the king, whom Wolsey had 'served better than he had served his God.' What is the authority for asserting that there were any changes in the new 'ministry' beyond the transfer of the chancellorship from Wolsey to More, —whom Mr. Froude himself describes as 'the person least affected to the clergy who could have been found among the leading laymen,' and whom he labours to prove a far closer ally of the intolerant bishops, and a far worse persecutor, than Wolsey himself,—and the promotion to the presidency and vice-presidency of the Council of the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, both supple courtiers and enemies to the Reformation? We are expected to consider as perfectly *bonâ fide* the prosecution of Wolsey under an impudent misconstruction of the Statute of Provisors, for having exercised the office of Papal Legate within the realm, with the king's full knowledge and approbation, and not 'in pursuit of his own ends' only, but mainly in pursuit of the ends of the king. We may venture to doubt whether, if the two legates had given sentence in the king's favour, and Henry's 'eyes had been opened' afterwards to the quibble about the Statute of Provisors, he would have 'resented the betrayal of his confidence' by Wolsey; or whether he would not rather have applied his familiar epithets of 'varlet' and 'knave, knave, and beastly fool' to the officious lawyer who had opened his eyes upon the subject. The Statute of Provisors, we venture to submit, had not 'fallen into desuetude,' though the interpretation of it which made the office of Papal Legate an 'office or dignity in the Anglican Church,' probably had. On the whole, it would be better to rest the case against Wolsey and in favour of royal honour and gratitude on that clause of the articles of impeachment which charged the king's favourite minister with breathing an infectious disease into the king's ear.

Mr. Froude's whole account of the memorable Parliament of 1529 is based on the assumption that it was a perfectly independent Parliament, freely elected by the people of England, and expressing the popular will in its measures and manifestoes.

'The election had taken place in the midst of great and general excitement; and the members chosen, if we may judge from their acts and their petitions, were men of that broad resolved temper, who only in times of popular effervescence are called forward into prominence. It would have been probably useless for the Crown to attempt dictation or repression at such a time, if it had desired to do so. Under the actual circumstances, its interest was to encourage the fullest expression of public feeling.'

And the king is represented as 'constitutionally conservative'—that is, the prince evidently 'chosen by Providence for the 'conduct of the Reformation' is represented as constitutionally opposed to it, but as having the tact to perceive that he could not stem the current of popular feeling, which it seems, by a fortunate coincidence, swelled suddenly and irresistibly against the papal power, just at the moment when that power obstructed Henry's wishes. The king was fortunate in coincidences. His desire to get rid of Catherine and marry her rival was 'one of 'those rare cases where inclination coincides with right;' and here again interest coincides with the irresistible force of circumstances in letting loose Parliament to bully the Pope.

Now Hall (whose authority is decisive) tells us expressly, that in this Parliament '*the most parte of the Commons were the 'kinge's servantes*;' and he tells us this in connexion with the passing of an Act, admirably illustrative of the 'broad and 'resolved temper' of the popular legislators by whom it was passed—the Act 21 Hen. VIII. c. 24. for releasing to the king all the sums of money which he had borrowed of subjects. Mr. Froude's palimpsest says nothing of this Act, though it gives a pretty full account of the legislation of the session, and by this omission his whole account of the character of the Parliament of 1529 is saved from decisive confutation. A similar Act, however (35 Hen. VIII. c. 12.), was passed in 1544; and there Mr. Froude mentions it, and gives the following account of the matter:—

'When the war broke out the exchequer was empty. The first payment of the subsidy which had been granted in the year preceding had not as yet fallen due, and the king, in anticipation of the approaching return, had applied for a loan which had been raised in graduated proportions from the ordinary tax-payers. He had in fact required and received a portion of the parliamentary grant a few months before its time. The people who were aware that a war involved a war taxation, submitted without complaining to a proceeding which was manifestly necessary.'

It is a pity that the framers of the two statutes should not have been aware of this version of their proceedings, and that

they should have excluded it in advance, by specifying 'sums advanced by way of prest and loan, *either particularly, or by any taxation made of the same,*' as well as by the clause which compels those individuals whom the king had repaid to refund the repayment to the king. In a note, Mr. Froude adds:—

'I confess myself unable to see the impropriety of this proceeding, or to understand the censures which historians have so freely lavished upon it: unless indeed they have believed that all wars in any generation but their own are necessarily unjust, and all taxation tyranny; or have believed that the Parliament was generous to the king at the expense of a limited number of credulous and injured capitalists. As a question of taxation, the proof of contemporary complaint is the only justification of historical disapprobation.'

Credulous the capitalists certainly were, for we learn from the statute that some of them had disposed of their claims on the exchequer as they would of any ordinary debt: injured, according to Mr. Froude's version, they were not. Nothing is more probable than that Mr. Hallam and other writers on this period of history should have believed that all wars in any generation but their own are necessarily unjust, and all taxation tyranny, till their purblind prejudices were dissipated by Mr. Froude. As to the requisite evidence of contemporary complaint, Hall says, in regard to the Repudiation Act of 1529, that 'when this release of the loane was knowne to the Comons of the realme, Lord! so they grudged and spake ill of the hole Parliament, for almost every manne counted it his dette, and reconed suerly of the payment of the same, and therefore some made there willes of the same, and some other did set it over to other for debt, and so many men had losse by it, which caused them sore to murmur, but there was no remedy.' These complaints appear to have been as nearly contemporary as the time required for the publication of the Act of Parliament would permit.

The clerical abuses which were attacked in 1529 undoubtedly cried loudly for reform. But we must demur to the pervading assumption that the Crown and the lay lords were clear of those abuses. The ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown had been grossly and systematically abused. No instances of pluralism had been more flagrant than those of Crown favourites, like Wickham and Wolsey. And as to ecclesiastical morality, the statute 27 Henry VI. c. 6. pardons, in consideration of a subsidy, all rapes which had been committed by priests.

The cautious reader will be on his guard throughout against Mr. Froude's tendency to identify himself with laymen and lay statesmen and to bear hard on the clerical cloth, for the 'zeal' of

whose wearers he prescribes 'the gallows and the lash' with great unction. The infamous extortion of an enormous sum from the clergy at this period, on pretence that they were involved in the premunire for having acknowledged Wolsey's legatine functions, while the laity were freely pardoned, affords the historian a glorious subject for banter and exultation and for the full enjoyment of the feeling that he is on the stronger side. He demonstrates the iniquity of the proceeding with some gusto, and winds up by saying,—'But their punishment, if tyrannical in form, was equitable in substance, and 'we can reconcile ourselves without difficulty to an act of judicial confiscation.' He is charitable enough to speak for us all, but we fear he will find many of us wanting in the love of oppression, even though the victims be ecclesiastics.

In the midst of these ecclesiastical reforms, this Parliament passed the singular Act 22 Hen. VIII. c. 9. for the boiling of John Rouse, who was alleged to have poisoned some domestics and almspeople of the Bishop of Rochester, in the attempt, as was supposed, to poison the anti-Protestant bishop himself. A shadow of party feeling rests on the whole affair. From Mr. Froude's solemn observations on this Boiling Alive Act, as well as from many other passages in this book, Mr. Carlyle may derive the lesson which is sometimes best taught by a caricature. John Rouse is by no means allowed the benefit of the plea that with people in general 'he could do the right thing, say the 'right thing,' but that with the Bishop of Rochester's servants and almspeople he 'was under a fatal necessity of mistake.' On the contrary, in his case 'we purchase compassion for utter 'wickedness only by doubting in our hearts whether wickedness 'is more than misfortune.' Those who may have been shocked by the necessarianism of the 'Shadows of the Clouds,' must certainly allow that in approving with awful satisfaction the punishment of boiling alive, Mr. Froude makes as liberal a concession to the doctrine of Free Will as any temperate advocate of that doctrine can desire. After a slight excess in sentimentalism, a man's 'moral sinew' may require a little 'stringent 'bracing' in the shape of bloody vagrancy laws, women flogging, and boiling alive, but he must not suppose that all the world will relish such tonics. The edifying detestation expressed by 'His Highness' of this 'Italian' crime, as Mr. Froude calls it, may be compared with the subsequent intimation of Cromwell that 'His Highness' knew the ways that might be found in *Italy* to rid a traitorous subject like Cardinal Pole. The 'awful and solemn horror of evil things' which filled the 'stern' but 'tender' spectators of the boiling alive of a human

being 'in that old cattle market,' may also be illustrated by reference to the 'old statute' 5 Henry IV. c. 5. against the daily practice of cutting out people's tongues and putting out their eyes. Perhaps the horror shown of evil things in general would have been as great, and the horror of one evil thing in particular greater, if John Rouse, instead of being committed to the cauldron by Act of Parliament without a trial, had been tried before he was boiled. That 'the temper which this act exhibits is the 'key to all which has *seemed* most dark and cruel in the rough 'years which followed,' is a candid but indiscreet admission.

The boiling of John Rouse seems to revive in Mr. Froude the love of roasting. 'For the poisoners of the soul there was 'the stake, for the poisoners of the body the boiling cauldron; 'the two most fearful punishments for the two most fearful of 'crimes.' 'Most shocking,' he adds in a note, 'when the *wrong* 'persons were made the victims; and because clerical officials 'were altogether incapable of detecting the *right persons*, the 'memory of the practice has become abhorrent to all just men. 'I suppose, however, that if the *right persons* could have been 'detected, even the stake itself would not have been too tremendous a penalty for the destroying of human souls.' This opens rather an alarming prospect of the possible reappearance of clerical officials competent to detect the *right persons*, and therefore qualified to roast them. Stokesley and Torquemada may have sent the wrong persons to the stake, as Jeffreys sent the wrong persons to the gallows; but the incompetence of Jeffreys has not condemned the use of the gallows, and we do not see why the incompetence of Stokesley and Torquemada should condemn the use of the stake. 'Poisoning souls' is as great a crime as ever. The author of the 'Nemesis of Faith' would be tried, not by a set of purblind Papists, but by some of the most eminent and enlightened divines of our pure and reformed Church, who would very properly overrule all exceptions to their competency as a tribunal, and whose judgment, delivered by the highest authority, would be received with general satisfaction. At the same stake, perhaps, would be burned some miserable convert to the Papist heresies of the 'Lives of the English Saints.' As to that 'humanity which is deeper than logic,' it would be all on the side of taking 'tender' but 'stern' measures to prevent the poisoning of souls. How beautifully would the chief inquisitor, in pronouncing sentence, prove to the culprits that 'in this great matter of religion, in which to be right is the 'first condition of being right in any thing, not variety of 'opinion, but unity; not the equal licence of the wise and the 'foolish to choose their belief; but an ordered harmony, where

'wisdom prescribes a law to ignorance, is the rule which reasonable men should most desire for themselves and for mankind.' How would the religious public in the galleries applaud these sentiments, which are so skilfully addressed to their taste! We are willing, however, to admit that 'if a school of Thugs were to rise among us, making *murder* a religious service; if they gained proselytes, and the proselytes *put their teaching in execution*, we should speedily begin to persecute *opinion*.'

'A feeling of painful uncertainty continues to cling to us' whether the 'Act of Appeals,' while it pretended to be a general act, was not really a *privilegium*, intended to deprive Catherine of her appeal.

'How far the Parliament were justified by the extremity of the case is a further question, which it is equally difficult to answer. The alternative, as I have repeatedly said, was an all but inevitable civil war on the death of the king; and, practically, when statesmen are entrusted with the fortunes of an empire, the responsibility is too heavy to allow them to consider other interests. *Salus populi suprema lex*, ever has been and ever will be the substantial canon of policy with public men. I do not say that it ought to be. There are some acts of injustice which no national interest can excuse, however great in itself that interest may be, or however certain to be attained by the means proposed. Yet government in its simplest form is to an extent unjust; it trenches in its easiest tax on natural right and natural freedom; it trenches further and further in proportion to the emergency with which it has to deal.'

Mr. Froude's statesmen, who are in the habit of imposing political tests and putting people to death for refusing them, may also be in the habit of distinguishing the interest of society from justice, and making justice give way. But the instance he cites is hardly one in point, unless people have a natural right to enjoy the benefits of government without contributing to its expense. The reasoning of the passage is an example of the kind which we may call shading off, a kind of which Dr. Newman is a great master. Black, through interposition of a shade or two of grey, fades insensibly into white. But put the two ends together of the passage, and you see that the colour of a *privilegium* is rather different from that of a fair tax. We may remark by the way, that the preamble of this Act, asserting that the Church of England had been always independent of the Papal jurisdiction, affords a caution to those who may be inclined to take every thing said in an 'old Statute,' or a Tudor state paper, as Gospel truth.

It is due to Mr. Froude's moral sense to say that he knows very well what he has to deal with in the case of Fisher and

More, and lays his ground with care accordingly. When Archbishop Allen is murdered by the Irish rebels (a murder more political than religious), we are told that 'such were the men 'whose cause the Mores and the Fishers, the saintly monks of 'the Charterhouse, and the holy martyrs of the Catholic faith, 'believed to be the cause of the Almighty Father of the world.' By this little artifice the reader may be led to connect the names of More and Fisher with a crime which Mr. Froude would hardly venture to say they would not, both of them, have utterly detested and abhorred. Again, laborious efforts are made to prove that More was one of the most cruel of persecutors, and that under his chancellorship 'the stake resumed its 'hateful activity.' Wolsey was a model of toleration compared with him, though elsewhere we are told that it was 'under 'Wolsey's influence' that Henry 'persecuted the English Protestant.' As it requires something to make us believe that More was very inhuman, it is suggested that 'Sir Thomas 'More may be said to have lived to illustrate the necessary 'tendencies of Romanism in an honest mind convinced of its 'truth; to show that the test of sincerity in a man who professes to regard orthodoxy as an essential of salvation, is 'not the readiness to endure persecution, but the courage which 'will venture to inflict it.' All very fine, but let us see how Mr. Froude proves More to have exemplified this 'test of sincerity'—how he substantiates what he elsewhere (a little forgetting his cue) calls, with a bitter sneer, 'the philosophic 'mercies of Sir Thomas More.'

He sets out against More, with every artifice of rhetorical and typographical aggravation, four cases: (1), that of Philips; (2), that of Field; (3), that of Bilney; (4), that of Bainham.

In the case of Philips Mr. Froude, after going through the circumstances, has to own that 'the weight of guilt, in this 'instance, presses essentially on Stokesley.' More was bound, as Chancellor, to arrest the alleged heretic and deliver him to the diocesan. His taking part in the private examination of Philips, and his attempts to induce him to end the matter by confession, whether regular or not, is at least as likely to have been from motives of humanity as the reverse. And if 'he 'could not have been ignorant' of the imprisonment of Stokesley's victim, it does not follow that he was in any way to blame for it. Stokesley excommunicated Philips before he imprisoned him; and while the prisoner was lying under this sentence, neither the Chancellor nor any other legal authority had power to deliver him, as Mr. Froude seems partly aware. Moreover, a part at least of the three years' imprisonment must

have occurred after More had ceased to be Chancellor, and when he, therefore, could no longer be one of the 'pedants,' to whose deaf ears the prisoner clamoured in vain for justice.

Our only knowledge of Field's case is derived from a petition presented by Field himself to the Lord Chancellor Audeley and the Council, *after the disgrace of More*. Mr. Froude himself says, 'We can form but an imperfect judgment on the merits of the case, for we have only the sufferer's *ex parte* complaint, and More might probably have been able to make some counter-statement. But the illegal imprisonment cannot be explained away, and cannot be palliated; and when a judge permits himself to commit an act of arbitrary tyranny, we argue from the known to the unknown, and refuse reasonably to give him credit for equity when he was so little careful of law.' He seems to forget that the 'illegal imprisonment' from which he ventures to 'reason to the unknown,' rests exactly on the same *ex parte* evidence as the other portions of the story. The whole account is tainted by the utterly incredible statement that, 'as your bedeman heard say,' Sir Thomas More, after retiring from the Chancellorship, made interest with the Duke of Norfolk through the Bishops of London and Winchester, to have the petitioner committed to prison again.

Bilney's case is prefaced by an insinuating statement, that, 'no sooner had the seals changed hands (from Wolsey to More), than the Smithfield fires recommenced; and, *encouraged by the Chancellor*, the bishops resolved to obliterate in these edifying spectacles the recollection of their general infirmities.' Yet with this case Mr. Froude absolutely fails to connect More in any way whatever. Bilney was first cited before Wolsey; then before the Bishop of London, who induced him to recant; and, finally, before the Bishop of Norwich, who sent him to the stake. More, in his preface to his work against Tyndal, maintained that Bilney had recanted and died a Catholic, for which Foxe attacks him very scurrilously, and at great length; and we suppose this must have caught Mr. Froude's eye, and led him, without looking further into the matter, to set down Bilney's martyrdom to the account of Sir Thomas More. This, at least, is the only obvious explanation of the insertion of the case among those with which More was in any way concerned. Mr. Froude may have proof that the Chancellor 'encouraged' these proceedings of the bishops, but if he has he must produce it. Perhaps he will at the same time notice the statement of Erasmus (Ep. 426.) that 'he has it on good authority that the King (Henry VIII.) is somewhat more severe to heresy than the bishops and the priests (*aliquanto minus æquum esse novis dogmatibus quam episcopos aut sacerdotes*').

The last case is that of Bainham, in regard to which Mr. Froude takes, without hesitation, all the statements of Foxe, though where Foxe and Wyatt are against him, as in the case of Anne Boleyn, he can perceive that these writers 'were surrounded with the heat and flame of a controversy, in which public and private questions were wrapped inseparably together; and the more closely we scrutinise their narratives, the graver occasion there appears for doing so.' We must own, however, that he does not follow Foxe blindly. For while Mr. Froude says that Bainham 'made a farewell address to the people, laying his death expressly to More, whom he called his accuser and his judge,' Foxe only makes Bainham say, 'The Lord forgive Sir Thomas More, and pray for me all good people.' Bainham was in fact condemned to the stake, as appears from Foxe himself, not by More, but by Trafford, the Bishop of London's Vicar-General. But this is not all. Foxe says that Bainham was chained to a tree (Mr. Froude says to a post) in More's garden at Chelsea, and whipped. Now More explicitly denied that he had whipped any of the heretics in his custody. He said he had only whipped a boy belonging to his own household, who had taught another boy to speak against the sacrament, and a lunatic, who used to insult women in church. 'And of all who ever came in my hand for heresy, so help me God! saving, as I said, the mere keeping of them (and yet not so sure neither, but that George Constantine could steal away), else had never any of them any stripe or stroke given them, so much as a fillip on the forehead.' And how does Mr. Froude deal with this denial? At the beginning of the series of cases which he produces against More, he says, 'I do not intend in this place to relate the stories of his cruelties in his house at Chelsea, which he himself partially denied, and which at least we may hope were exaggerated. Being obliged to confine myself to specific instances, I choose rather those on which the evidence is not open to question; and which prove against More, not the zealous execution of a cruel law, for which we may not fairly hold him responsible, but a disregard, in the highest degree censurable, of his obligations as a law officer of the Crown.' 'In this place' (*i.e.* in this page) it is true he does not relate any thing that More denied; but a few pages on, he relates, as one of the series of cases which rest on 'evidence not open to question,' the whipping of Bainham at Chelsea, one of the cases to which More's denial would clearly apply.

Nothing is found in the palimpsest about More's personal and literary intimacy with the king, or of his having assisted

Henry in his work on the Supremacy, or of that deep remark, when the king had been strolling for an hour in the garden at Chelsea with his arm round More's neck, and More's son-in-law, Roper, congratulated him on being so 'familiarily entertained,'—'I thank our Lord, I find His Grace my very good lord 'indeed; and I believe he doth as singularly favour me as any 'subject within this realm; howbeit, son Roper, I may tell thee, 'I have no cause to be proud thereof, for if my head would win 'a castle in France it should not fail to go!' Nor are we informed that More had committed the crime of refusing to be present at Anne Boleyn's coronation; though he prayed for 'his 'highness's prosperous estate,' he 'being in possession of his 'marriage;' or that the ex-chancellor was accused, by a magnanimous government, of corruption in his office, and that he triumphantly repelled the accusation; or that he was charged, with still greater magnanimity, of having induced the king to commit himself too far in his book in defence of the Papal Supremacy, and that his reply was, that he had tried to moderate the king's language, and that the king had repelled his attempts with 'Whatever impediments be to the contrary, we will set 'forth that authority (the authority of the Popedom) to the 'utmost; for we receive from that see our crown imperial.'

Very faint, too, is the notion given by Mr. Froude, of the incidents of More's trial—of the character of Mr. Rich, the solicitor-general, the sole witness for the Crown, and the wretch who afterwards racked Anne Askew nearly to death with his own hands,—of the infamous means which he employed to extract a denial of the king's supremacy over the Church from More, who steadily declined to give an opinion on the subject, — or of the utter shame to which he was put at the trial by the breakdown of the two witnesses who were called to support his perjuries on behalf of the Crown. Mr. Froude invites us to believe that the Government had letters from More to Fisher in their hands sufficient to sustain the prosecution, but that they preferred, as the more satisfactory course, to put the solicitor-general in the witness-box and have him pilloried there. More's crushing defence is entirely omitted, with a judgment which we cannot but applaud. But we are told that he 'could not say 'that the facts were not true.' More prayed that if Rich, the only witness against him, were not perjured, he might never see the face of God. There is a similar 'economy' of unpleasant facts in regard to Fisher, the history of whose case, indeed, is almost entirely suppressed, on the artistic plea of 'concerning 'ourselves only with the nobler figure.' Not a word is said of the mission of the same Mr. Rich to the bishop in the Tower to

draw from him also a denial of the supremacy, and in this instance, under the assurance that the king desired his opinion on the subject. An impression which is the reverse of the truth on this point, however, is conveyed when it is said, in the matter of the Nun of Kent, that Fisher 'found mercy thrust 'upon him, till by fresh provocation the miserable old man forced 'himself on his fate.' The 'official statements' of the indulgence with which the aged prelate was treated in his prison, may be 'too positive and too minute to admit of a doubt;' but there is no deficiency of minuteness or positiveness in Fisher's letter to Cromwell, in which he complains that he is left without clothes to keep him warm or proper food to nourish him; and if this 'must have been an accident,' it was rather an awkward accident to occur under the government of a chivalrous king, who found it necessary to send to the scaffold such a man as Fisher, and for such an offence as refusing the test of supremacy. Less reverent critics will perhaps think that the broad assertion of Cromwell in his letter to Cassalis, that Fisher and More when in prison 'received all such indulgences in food and dress 'as their families desired,' throws some light on the veracity of Tudor manifestoes.

Of the Charterhouse monks, Haughton and five others were put to death by the cruel and disgusting method then usual in cases of treason, which to masculine minds appears 'austere' and 'stern work.' If any one wishes to know how a Rousseauist becomes a Terrorist, he may mark the way in which the sentimental historian is drawn, by the fascination of this reign of terror, to put himself always on the side of the Terrorist government and sympathise in the work of blood.

Mr. Froude does not pretend that Fisher, More, and Haughton were, in the ordinary sense, guilty men for refusing to deny their faith at the command of the king, though he is always slipping in 'offenders,' 'treason,' 'traitor.' On the contrary, he explicitly admits that 'there is no cause for which 'any man can more nobly suffer than to witness that it is 'better for him to die than to speak words which he does not 'mean.' There are two duties—your duty to God, and your duty to Henry; and if the two do not happen to be compatible, you must die. 'There may be no intention of treason on your 'part. The motive of your opposition may be purely religious,'—that will not save you. 'No honesty of meaning can render 'possible any longer a double loyalty to the Crown and to the 'Papacy,'—Henry must have your whole heart. You 'choose 'to be a confessor.' You are an eminent person, and if you are allowed with impunity to be true to your own conscience, others

may be encouraged to think like you. It is not the obedience of the outward act only that the king requires, but the obedience of the soul. To hang, draw, and quarter you is a 'necessity;' it is 'most piteous but most inevitable.' You are on the wrong side. You are 'guilty of not being able to read the 'signs of the times,' and see that since the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn, he is Head of the Church. Your 'exotic graces' cannot be preserved at the expense of more valuable things. You are an obstacle to 'the free thought which was bursting 'from the soil.' There is a danger of insurrection and invasion, with which you perhaps have no connexion, but which your existence may tend to encourage. You 'die miserably of prison 'fever and filth;' but as Mr. Froude says, in connexion with that very incident, 'we cannot blame the Government. Those 'who know what the condition of the country really was, must 'feel their inability to suggest, with any tolerable reasonableness, what else could have been done.' It was fatality, it was state necessity, it was historical retribution. Above all, it was Henry's will, a will which is above our scrutiny. 'History will rather dwell upon the incidents of the execution 'than attempt a sentence upon those who willed that it should 'be.' History cannot presume to pass a judgment upon an act of Henry VIII.,—she can only say, his will be done!

Henry, in Mr. Froude's account, stands in the place of Providence to require at the hands of those who had helped him to write his book in defence of the Roman Church all the righteous blood which the Roman Church had shed from the blood of Raymond of Toulouse to the blood of the last victim who had blackened into ashes at Smithfield. The last victims who had blackened into ashes at Smithfield before the execution of More and Fisher happened to be fourteen Anabaptists who had been sent to the stake by Henry himself 'to show,' as Mr. Froude says, 'that his justice was evenhanded.'

It is poetically insinuated that the cause for which Henry put Fisher, More, and the monks of the Charterhouse to death, was that of the Reformation, of which he was the champion. 'The Catholics had chosen the alternative, 'either to crush the free thought which was bursting from the 'soil, or else to be crushed by it; and the future of the world 'could not be sacrificed to preserve the exotic graces of medieval saints.' 'The value of the (king's) defence turns upon 'the point of the actual danger to the State, and the extent to 'which the conduct of the sufferers imperilled the progress of 'the Reformation.' The 'free thought' which was bursting 'from the soil' was certainly very dear to Henry, who was

doing his best to water the tender plant by dealing 'even-handed' justice to conscientious Catholics on the one hand and to conscientious Protestants on the other, and to foster it with the sunny influence of persecuting codes. 'His mind was moving,' says his admirer, when he burns fourteen Anabaptists, 'but heresy, though the definition of it was changing, remained a crime; and although the limits of permitted belief were imperceptibly enlarging, to transgress the recognised boundaries was an offence enormous as ever.' Such was the 'free thought' which required the congenial protection of supremacy tests and the shedding of innocent blood. We have yet to learn in what single point the definition of heresy had 'changed' at the time of the murder of Fisher and More, except in the substitution of the royal for the papal infallibility, which does not seem a great step towards 'the future of the world.' 'The king,' we are told elsewhere, 'was divided against himself. Nine days in ten he was the clear-headed, energetic, powerful statesman; on the tenth he was looking wistfully to the superstition which he had left, and the clear sunshine was darkened with theological clouds which broke in lightning and persecution.' One of these clouds passed over the royal sun of the Reformation rather late in its day of glory. It was the Six Bloody Articles Bill, imposing on the nation, under pain of death, all the cardinal doctrines of the Church of Rome. The great Parliament of 1529, the composition of which we have before indicated, in their list of grievances against the Church, demanded sharper penalties against heretics, a demand which the 'persecuting' bishops pronounced to be more charitable than necessary; and they impeached Wolsey, among other things, for checking the persecution of Lutherans at Cambridge. Long after this the king was in a fair way to be reconciled to the Roman See. He never lent a helping hand to the Protestants abroad, but as Mr. Froude allows, always shrunk from them, and only coquetted with them when driven by diplomatic necessity; the Tudors having been unable 'cordially to unite themselves with a form of thought which permitted resistance to authority, and which they regarded as eccentric and revolutionary.' Henry also remained the intimate friend of Francis I., and never remonstrated in any way against the proceedings of that perjured and lecherous, but orthodox monarch, when he atoned for the pleasures of the seraglio by the pleasures of the estrade. Surely, it requires some confidence in the imbecility of the reader to pretend that this man murdered Fisher and More for the sake of 'the free thought that was bursting from the

‘soil,’ and in order that they might not impede ‘the progress of the Reformation.’

Again, the plea that ‘the nation was standing with its sword half drawn in the face of an armed Europe, and it was no time to permit dissension in the camp,’ with much more to the same effect, and enveloping a principle equally wise and moral, might be urged in ‘miserable extenuation of the crimes of the French Terrorists, but could not be urged in extenuation of the crimes of Henry and his Audeleys and Riches. The ‘armed Europe’ was simply the Emperor, who had been outraged by Henry’s treatment of his aunt, but whose enmity was so far from being inexpiable, that some years afterwards we find him engaged with Henry in an alliance, highly approved of by Mr. Froude, as a matter of rejoicing to ‘those who wished well to rational freedom in Christendom—who would have Popish and Protestant fanatics alike crushed into moderation.’ Henry’s friend of the seraglio and the estrapade was quite disposed to take his side; and the German Lutherans would, of course, have been glad of his alliance. Perhaps a cordial union with the Lutherans would have strengthened the nation as much as shedding innocent and honoured blood. Mr. Froude, when he insinuates that the Catholics must have joined an invader, who came to execute the Pope’s sentence, forgets how the Catholics actually behaved at the time of the Armada; not to mention that the Bull of Deposition was not published till three years after the martyrdom of More and Fisher. As to ‘the whole Irish insurrection blazing up behind the screenwork of these ‘innocents,’ we do not argue against metaphors; but Mr. Froude must know that neither More, Fisher, nor the monks of the Charterhouse had any thing whatever to do with the insurrection in Ireland, with which he so assiduously connects their names. Whether discontent in England was removed by these ‘piteous inevitabilities,’ let the insurrection in Lincolnshire and the Pilgrimage of Grace decide.

It has not occurred to Mr. Froude that in writing the apology of Henry for crushing the Catholics in England, he is writing the apology of Charles V. and Philip II. for crushing the Protestants in the Low Countries and Spain; or that he will hereafter have to defend Queen Elizabeth for abetting in France precisely the ‘treason’ which he thinks a justification for any number of judicial murders in this country.

Mr. Froude very truly says that ‘the anger and surprise at the murder of Fisher and More was not confined to Rome. Through England, through France, through Flanders, even among the Protestants of Germany, there rose a simultaneous

'outcry of astonishment. Rumour flew to and fro with a thousand falsehoods; and the unfortunate leaven of the Anne Boleyn marriage told fatally to destroy that appearance of probity of motive so indispensable to the defence of the government.' The reader will not fail to note the substitution of 'astonishment' for 'indignation,' and the 'thousand falsehoods of rumour' which so conveniently suggest that Europe did not know what had actually occurred. To the clear contemporary evidence, however, which even Mr. Froude's account of the effect produced by the death of Fisher and More in Protestant Europe affords both as to the morality and expediency of that act, there seems little to reply, except, 'Let us close our lips and pass by, and not speak of it. When a nation is in the throes of revolution wild spirits are abroad in the storm.' With 'wild spirits' (wholly independent, of course, of the Government) and 'necessity' a good deal of difficulty may be surmounted. It is a pity that Cromwell did not perceive the controversial utility of these airy agencies when he was elaborately apologizing to Europe for the proceedings of his government in a case which, according to Mr. Froude, 'seemed to him so clear as to require no apology.' He might then have been spared the necessity of stating 'many important facts' of which, as Mr. Froude very accurately says, 'we have no other knowledge.'

Of the ultimate effect of the murders of the Catholic Martyrs on the cause of the Reformation, it seems enough to say, with Mr. Froude, that 'their sufferings nobly borne sufficed to recover the sympathy of after ages for the faith which they professed.'

Of course, we must not presume to scrutinise the mental sensations of 'him who willed' that Fisher and More should be beheaded and Haughton and his monks drawn and quartered for refusing to profess the contrary of what he had himself maintained with the utmost violence a few years before, or to inquire whether Henry reflected at all on his own position. As to the atrocious cruelties practised on the Charterhouse monks, that was all the 'wild spirits' and the 'English,' who were 'a hard, fierce people.' It is gratifying to know, however, that 'the king was not without feeling. It was no matter of indifference to him that he found himself driven to such stern courses with his subjects; and as the golden splendour of his manhood was thus sullenly clouding, he commanded all about his court to poll their heads' in public token of mourning; 'and to give them example, he caused his own head to be polled, and from thenceforth his beard to be knotted, and to be no more

'shorn.' This seems almost too great a concession on the part of Henry VIII. to the ordinary feelings of humanity.

In his obvious anxiety to prejudice the reader against Anne Boleyn, who is the next victim, Mr. Froude throws it out that 'if More's opinions had been insufficient for his destruction, 'there was an influence at court which left no hope to him; 'the influence of one whose ways and doings were better known 'then than they have been to her modern admirers.' This is a little improvident. If Anne Boleyn's antipathy was allowed to influence the king in such a matter as this, what is to be thought of the character of the king?

Mr. Froude does not feel unkindly towards the Catholic martyrs. They are guilty of what he calls 'treason'; that is, of not submitting their consciences to the dictation of a tyrant: and the 'will' of those who put them to death is what he cannot suffer to be questioned. But he quite acknowledges the innocence of their intentions, and the fact that it was their 'virtues' that 'drove them into treason,' and he decorates their end with some very sweet rhetoric. We have already alluded to the eloquent passage in which Mr. Froude paints the Catholics and the Protestants as 'two armies of martyrs 'waging war, not upon the open field in open action, but 'on the stake and on the scaffold, with the nobler weapons 'of passive endurance.' The reader, in perusing that passage, will bear in mind that the sufferings of the two armies are not mutually inflicted, but inflicted upon both of them alternately by Henry, who stands safe above the glorious fray. Probably, however, the moral agony which the king went through, and which led him to alter the mode of dressing his beard and hair, was equivalent to any sufferings of the objects of his 'evenhanded justice.' Blessed new era of the religion of liberty and love, which opened with tyranny over conscience and sanguinary persecutions! Happy nation, whose king was so tender-hearted that he changed the cut of his beard when justice required him to shed innocent blood on the scaffold or at the stake!

We are compelled, by want of space, to refrain from fully examining Mr. Froude's treatment of the case of Anne Boleyn, who is the next victim. Every attentive reader will perceive that, under cover of profuse expressions of sentimental pity, he labours hard for a conviction. He tries to prejudice us beforehand against Anne Boleyn, as he does against More, by telling us that in her portraits 'the lips and mouth wear a look of sensuality which is not to be mistaken,' by dwelling on her 'epicurism,' by candidly admitting that the affair with

Lord Percy was not 'openly' to her discredit, and by throwing as much as possible on her the blame of acts of indelicacy towards Catherine, which a perverse world, disloyally condemning the strong tempter more than the weak and tempted, has laid mainly to the account of the 'chivalrous' king. When he comes to the trial itself, he resorts to the little artifice of solemnly citing before the bar of posterity the names of a long list of jurymen, about whom (with a single exception) we know absolutely nothing. He never inquires whether, in the whole course of the reign, a judge and jury once acquitted the victim of a Crown prosecution. He forbids us to accuse the form of the trial, on the ground that 'it was the form which 'was always observed;' and expects us to believe that the king, who could pass acts of attainder, confiscate great masses of property, and override the law by proclamations, could not venture, when his honour was most concerned, to give his own wife a fair trial. He tries to take off the effect of that letter of Anne to the king which so powerfully breathes her innocence, and the guilt of those who were doing her to death, by 'being obliged to add' that its 'tone' is 'unbecoming,' and by bidding us 'remember' that the writer had betrayed the king's confidence from the beginning by concealing from him the canonical impediment to this marriage; the draft dispensation to get rid of the impediment having, we presume, been prepared entirely without the knowledge of the king. We are to believe, for the purposes of this inquiry, that such a man as the Duke of Norfolk, who figures in Mr. Froude's own pages as the author of a most dastardly attempt to assassinate Aske, and who, if Mr. Froude is right, was at last justly condemned to die for high treason, was a Wellington in integrity because he was a Wellington in military skill. The filthy and ignominious proceedings against Anne of Cleves, in which all the 'Wellingtons and Nelsons' were concerned, are kept entirely out of sight, though most histories would have thought they threw a good deal of light on the conduct of the same men in the case of Anne Boleyn. The possibility is not hinted at, though one would think it must have occurred to any mind, that when the Earl of Wiltshire took part in condemning his own children, he did so under the influence of terror. Mr. Froude has read Constantyne's Memorial, but his eye has not fallen on the statement that the confession of Mark Smeton, who alone of the persons accused persevered in his confession, was reported to have been extorted by 'grievous racking.' The contemporary evidence of the Lord of Milherve, preserved in Meteren and cited by Foxe, to the effect that the magistrates of London, and

others who were present at the trial, said they saw no evidence against the queen, but only a determination to be rid of her, is judiciously alluded to only in a note, with a slighting intimation that 'it may be read elsewhere.' Constantyne says there was 'much muttering' at the time among the people, but the historian, though he feels that 'the English nation deserves justice at our hands,' does not see fit to mention this point in their favour. Yet Mr. Froude does not venture, in presence of the facts even as represented by himself, to state plainly that he believes this woman, of whom Cranmer said that he 'never had better opinion in woman than he had in her,' to have been guilty of the unutterable crimes laid to her charge. He waits till his fourth volume, and then, when speaking of the case of Catherine Howard, he slips in the expression 'no reasonable doubt could be entertained that the King had a *second time* suffered the worst injury which a wife could inflict upon him, that a *second adultery*, a *second act of high treason*, must be enforced and punished.' Anne, in her 'unbecoming' letter to the king, pointed to Henry's love for her rival, Jane Seymour, as the cause of her destruction. Henry confirmed her assertion by marrying Jane Seymour the day after he had sent to the scaffold, without a fair trial, his wife and the mother of his child. Mr. Froude is of opinion that this proceeding 'is a proof that Henry looked at matrimony as an indifferent official act which his duty required at the moment;' and he adds, 'if this be thought a novel interpretation of his motives, I have merely to say that I find it in the Statute Book.' Where does he expect to find such infamies but in the Statute Book of a Tudor king, coloured a little (it must, in justice to the sycophants of that day, be observed) by his own hero-worshipping imagination? But the best is yet to come. When Jane Seymour's marriage with the king is being related, the 'unbecoming' letter of Anne Boleyn is fresh in the reader's mind. But when we arrive at Jane Seymour's death, the recollection of the letter may have grown fainter; and then it is thought safe to observe that Jane 'married the king under circumstances peculiarly agitating, without preparation, *without attachment either on her part or on his*, but under the pressure of a sudden and tragical necessity.' It would be painting the lily indeed to comment on these words. Otherwise we might remark that the 'tragical necessity' of providing an heir no longer existed after the birth of Prince Edward; yet on the very first day of the king's bereavement, the inflexible Privy Council again called on him to immolate himself to his country on the hymeneal altar, by taking another wife, and he once more

'saw that it must be so, and resigned himself,' though he by no means resigned himself to such an ugly woman as Anne of Cleves. The historian repeatedly fails, when interpreting a particular action of Henry, to 'give him the benefit' of other incidents of a similar kind in his career.

It is the same thing throughout. It was right to execute amnestied rebels, because they 'showed symptoms of an animus' which the Crown prosecutors would regard as treasonable, and because 'a chasm lay between the two estimates of the subject.' The torturing of Forrest is laid to 'ecclesiastics,' whom, we are to suppose, the king could not control. The king was under the painful necessity of putting Cromwell to death because 'the law in a free country cannot keep pace with genius;' his Highness's disappointment in the person of Anne of Cleves having nothing to do with the matter. 'In fairness, Cromwell should have been tried; but it would have added nothing to his chances of escape. He could not disprove the accusations. He could but have said that he had done right, not wrong; a plea which would *have been but a fresh crime.*' The mitred 'abbots,' whose 'quartered trunks' the approving eye of the stern historian sees by anticipation 'rotting by the high-way,' had given cause for suspicion in the late disturbances; *that is to say*, they had grown to advanced age as faithful subjects of the Papacy; they were too old to begin life again with a new 'allegiance,' — therefore it was quite right and necessary to put them out of the way. The execution of the Abbot of Glastonbury for a crime which is admitted to be formal, may seem needless cruelty 'to the modern student.' As to Montague and Exeter, 'however justly we may now accuse the equity which placed men on their trial for treason, for impatient expressions, *there can be no uncertainty* that, in the event of an invasion, or of a rebellion, with any promise of success in it, both Montague and Exeter would have thrown their weight into the rebel scale.' Where there can be no uncertainty, what need can there be of proof? The case of Sir Nicholas Carew was 'the hardest,' but Henry's will be done! As to the execution of Lady Salisbury, untried, by Act of Attainder, 'a settled age can imperfectly comprehend an age of revolution, or realise the indifference with which men risk their own blood (when did Henry risk his own blood?) and the blood of others, when battling for a great cause.' In the case of Norfolk and Surrey, 'there is little to regret if the king saw no reason to look leniently on the insolent ambition *which would have ruined a great cause, and filled England with the blood of innocents.*' So much for 'the veteran who had won his spurs at Flodden.'

The execution of the Earl of Suffolk, in the early part of Henry's reign, does not occur to the historian as throwing any light on this Turk-like clearing off of possible pretenders at the end. When the 'entries in the register of death' come rather thick, they call forth the pious and philosophic observation that, 'on the whole, Providence gives little good in this world for 'which suffering, in large measure or small, is not exacted as 'payment, and the king and the country (?) alike, on the whole, 'had reason to be well satisfied.' The eagerness of the Crown to depress and decimate the old aristocracy, bore no analogy to the political tendencies of Louis XI. and Henry VII., but was the result of a high principle of social morality which 'made 'responsibility the especial privilege of rank.'

At the fifth wife, it is felt that the philosophic curiosity of the reader will be naturally excited, and require some account of these successive catastrophes; and the account is, that there was 'a business-like habit of proceeding' about the king which led to connubial infelicity. 'We rise from the laborious perusal (of the 'many thousand documents' relating to the reign) 'with 'the conviction, rather, that the king's disposition was naturally cold; and that if he kept at least one mistress and had six wives, it was from a self-denying submission to the dictates of public duty. In slandering the honour of Anne of Cleves, and getting rid of her, to marry some one else, he was also, we presume, influenced by 'natural coldness.' The alternating divorces and uxoricides of Catholic and Protestant wives appear to have been arranged by a tasteful Destiny preserving the 'symmetry of misfortune.' The king's apparent vacillations in religion, and the alternating persecutions by which they were accompanied, were really, it seems, a steady policy of moderation. The king wished to ensure the triumph of the Reformation by keeping it within bounds, and cutting off the heads of 'men of genius,' like Cromwell, who attempted to go too fast. It was in pursuance of this moderating policy that he first required his subjects, on pain of death, to believe in three Sacraments, and afterwards in seven, and that he first abolished all the monasteries, and then enforced the observance of monastic vows. The triumph of moderate Protestantism was complete when the Six Bloody Articles reimposed on England all the leading doctrines of the Roman Catholic Faith. Liberty of conscience seems rather an essential part of Protestantism, but, after all, a little violation of it is a good thing in its way. 'Not variety of opinion, but unity — not the equal 'license of the wise and foolish to choose their belief — but an 'ordered harmony, where wisdom (the wisdom of Henry VIII.)

'prescribes a law to ignorance (the ignorance of More and 'Latimer), is the rule which reasonable men should most 'desire for themselves and for mankind.'

Besides, 'if Henry erred' in so slight a matter as imposing false doctrines and persecuting the true, 'his errors 'might find excuse in the multitude of business which was 'crowded upon him.' The various inroads upon the constitution made in the course of the reign were really so many instances of revolutionary enthusiasm exalting a popular chief. The Act empowering the 'king *for the time being*,' to make laws by royal proclamation without the consent of Parliament, was analogous to the Roman practice of appointing a temporary Dictator to carry the state through a crisis. The Acts enabling the king to repudiate his loans were graduated retrospective property taxes. Benevolences were a spontaneous act of 'the gentlemen' who 'preferred the honour 'of England to their personal convenience.' Alderman Reed and Alderman Roch, who were so insolent as to think benevolences unconstitutional, were the one justly imprisoned, the other pressed for the northern wars, 'amidst general amusement and approbation,' which the chroniclers to whom Mr. Froude refers have omitted to record. The debasing of the coin, as we have mentioned before, was 'a loan from the mint,' similar in principle to the suspension of cash payments. The monastery lands, which might have obviated the necessity of benevolences, had been 'melted down into cannon,' some pieces of which, of large calibre, now form the inheritance of the houses of Seymour, Fitzwilliam, and Russell. The miscarriages in Ireland were not caused by sending out incompetent men and starving the service. The fact is, 'the country 'has exerted a magical power of transformation upon every one 'connected with it. The hardest English understanding has 'given way before a few years of residence there; the most 'solid good sense has melted under the influence of its atmosphere'—as was the case, for example, with Lord Chesterfield and Lord Wellesley. The wrongs done to the Irish people, who were forbidden to intermarry with the conquering race, or to hold office in their own land, disappear, and nothing remains but their faults, calling for exemplary coercion. Henry's foreign policy was all straightforward and sound, and that of his opponents was all the reverse. The plot for kidnapping the King of Scotland, and carrying him off to London in time of peace, was a plan for 'employing some gentle constraint,' since 'a free visit could not be arranged.' The plot for assassinating Cardinal Beton, was 'looking at things as they were, and not

'through conventional forms.' The diplomatic lying which Paget reports to his master, was 'honest service.' The alliance with the Emperor against the German Protestants, which led to the sack of Cleves, was all in favour of moderate Protestantism. In short, such a 'palimpsest' never was found before.

We began by paying a just tribute to the merits of those portions of Mr. Froude's work which his paradox does not affect. The greater portion of our limited space has necessarily been taken up in examining the grounds of the extraordinary revolution which he has undertaken to effect in this period of English history. Our opinion upon his reasonings and their result is not doubtful: and we would once more urge him to reconsider his *Henry VIII.* if he wishes his history to live. But we must end with the renewed expression of the pleasure we have derived from many parts of the work, especially those which delineate the religious parties of the time. The interest of the new matter is extreme, and it is given for the most part in the most interesting manner. Even on the character of *Henry VIII.* himself as a theologian and statesman, some new light has probably been thrown. Mr. Carlyle has a good deal to answer for in having been the means, by his splendid but dangerous example, of spoiling what might have been so good a book, and compelling its honest critics to say, that it may stand very high in the estimation of those who look in a history only for interest and excitement, but that it cannot stand high in the estimation of those who look in a history above all things for the truth.

ACT. X. — *Sakountalá, or the Lost Ring* ; an Indian Drama.
Translated into English Prose and Verse from the Sanskrit of Kálidása. By MONIER WILLIAMS, M. A. Professor of Sanskrit at Haileybury. Hertford: 1855. •

EPIC and lyric poetry have found a home wherever the human soul has emerged from barbarism; they belong alike to all the cultured tribes of mankind. Wherever the past has lured with its world of mythic splendours, or the present and future, by their yet nearer impress, have woke the poet's inner life of thought, there the epos and ode have ever risen as the instinctive voice of these deep emotions of the soul. But dramatic poetry is no such cosmopolite. It comes to us indissolubly linked with the history of that great family of nations, already associated with so much that is great and glorious in the fasti of our world, whose languages bear the treasures of all Gentile thought, and have ever been the medium of European civilization. The drama, in a word, is the peculiar glory of the Indo-Teutonic race.

Not that we would claim for every member of that family a right to this splendid heirloom: there are many nations of high intellectual name, who have no part in the inheritance. Thus ancient Rome and modern Persia have no indigenous drama, no national form which has struck its roots down deep in the national character, and draws direct a living energy from its secret elements of vigour and strength. We feel, when we read the Roman comedies, that these have no vital union with the nation's 'heart of hearts;' they are borrowed from another soil, and here languish in an uncongenial clime. A national drama can only exist by expressing the national character, by gathering into itself all that is great and heroic in its past history and present development. Every great dramatic literature is a world in itself, which reproduces on a smaller scale all those strong lines of influence, which have been working on the people from generation to generation, and have made its inner and outer life what they are. Who cannot read in the dramas of Greece, Spain, or England, the long succession of busy years of action, whose annals, at the very sound of their names, rise at once to fill the mind with images — years which have left their stamp on the nation's very type of countenance, how much deeper still on what is yet more plastic, its inner character and soul?

Ancient India, like ancient Greece, has a drama of her own, which, untouched by foreign influence, and fostered only by native culture, has flourished and declined with an original history; exemplifying under that distant sky, in its lonely cycle of development, the same laws of growth and decay, which have been so unceasingly at work in our busier western world. Contemporary with Lucretius and Catullus, it reached its greatest splendour at the court of Vikramáditya, King of Oujein; and Kálidása, whose *chef d'œuvre* has been so lately translated into English, was one of the 'nine gems' which attest the munificence of that renowned patron of Hindú literature.

In these poems we find faithfully portrayed the Indian mind as it was in those old days. The nation of dreaming mystics, on whom Alexander's contemporaries gazed with such bewildered awe, between whom and the impulsive Greeks there lay a gulf which no man living could pass, have reproduced themselves in their dramas, and thrown on the canvass of mythic distance the outlines of their own present and its world. Their dramas, as opposed to the classical, may belong to the romantic school; but in truth they might be almost said to constitute a class by themselves,—cut off, like the Indian mind, from all those mighty influences, which for some 3000 years have been moulding Europe into what she is. It is indeed a strange problem to contemplate the Indian mind pacing its lonely round; no 'spot of dull stagnation' like China, but full of energy, and life, and hope:

‘A still salt pool locked in with bars of sand,
Left on the shore, that hears all night
The plunging waves draw backward from the land
Their moon-led waters white,’

save that India, locked in by the Indus and Himalaya, lay far away and apart, where even the faintest echoes of Greece or Europe could never reach her. The great masters of human thought and language have to the Indian mind lived in vain; it has run through its solitary cycle and worked out its own weary problem alone; yet India has a literature of poetry and philosophy which reaches back to the earliest times, older than Troy and the *Iliad*, perhaps as old as the *Pentateuch* itself. There were Indian poets before Homer had lisped his first song; there were Indian thinkers and philosophers, before Thales called water the *ἀρχή* of all things; and though this succession of writers has now dwindled down to idle poetasters and pedantic gram-

marians, it has never ceased from those earliest ages down even to the present day. Like the 345 kings, whose statues Herodotus beheld in the hall of the temple of Thebes, the long series stretches back from our time, 'Piromis from Piromis, man from man,' till it is lost in the darkness of antiquity. And yet, strange to tell, with this long line of poets and sages, India has no history, — with a literature which would almost rival an Alexandrian library, she knows absolutely nothing of the past. It is to Western scholars that she will owe all that she ever knows of her history; it is only a Lassen or a Wilson, who have thrown any light in the gloom. Each successive generation of Hindús has received the 'torch of life' from its forerunners, and each has lived its little span and left its songs and its dreams; but none of the long series has bestowed one passing thought on preserving the memory of the events in the midst of which it lived and died. The present, in fact, to the true Hindú had no charms; the world was but a hideous prison-house, whose cells were the weary round of transmigrations, through which the soul must pass ere it regain its final home. What matter whether dynasties rise or fall? what are earth's trivial interests to him? The present lies as the fitful feverish dream between two solemn states of repose, the silent irrevocable past, and the silent inexorable future; and it is to these that the Hindú thinker turns, to plunge into their still depths. The past is peopled with gigantic mythologies, with dynasty behind dynasty of gods, with cycles upon cycles of Brahma's days, and all their complicated involutions of years, in vain efforts to bridge over the abyss; as if any finite number, however enormous, could be an appreciable fraction of eternity, or any sum of years, though æons be heaped on æons, could give us any *parallax* of the Divine existence.

Amidst this hopeless reaching after the illimitable distance, the transient present vanishes and is lost. All of India's past history, that is still preserved, is saved for us in spite of herself. The words that escaped from the lips of those old sages come fraught with a message far other than that which the speaker entrusted to their charge; and it is from the questioning of these, their messengers, that comparative philology has gained its most splendid triumphs. The Sanskrit of ancient India is the great instrument of its discoveries; and to the language of these dreaming Brahmas, by a strange revolution, we owe our deepest insight into the true structure and history of the languages of such intensely self-conscious nations as Greece and Rome.

Like her religion, poetry, philosophy, grammar, India's drama is peculiarly her own. The same influences are at work to mould it, the same fond absorption in the past, amid a world of ideal pictures, on which the soul gazed, like the Carthusian monk in his convent, till it seemed as though *these* were the realities, and all else but the dream.

The heroic plays of the Indian stage lie apart from the world of Indian life, in a soft slumberous atmosphere of their own; the air comes laden with a luxurious faintness, which tells of the effeminate people who dwell there. The dramas of *Æschylus* are, indeed, unreal,—they are cast in a world of Titanic inhabitants, and belong not to our mortal earth; but these primæval giants have still hearts and souls like ourselves; and even in the 'Prometheus,' with its lonely ocean and Caucasus, we know that beneath the horizon lies the world of toiling man; that *there* are the poet's own Athens and Marathon, could we only see beyond the sea line. But the Indian drama has no such deep root of connexion with life; it is unreal and ethereal as a *Midsummer Night's Dream* throughout.

And yet, even in this world of fiction, one strange element of life and reality comes to view; all the more startling from the universal colouring of glamour light which overspreads all the rest. We refer to the language in which they are written; and here is opened a question of curious and unexpected interest. Unlike the other monuments of ancient Hindú thought, these plays are not written in the purely sacred Sanskrit; they admit a mixture of a baser and more vulgar alloy. The heroes, indeed, still speak the language of the demigods, a language which, in the poet's time, had doubtless ceased to be the medium of social intercourse; but the female characters and servants generally use an inferior dialect. This patois, or Prákrit, is derived from Sanskrit, as Italian or Spanish from Latin; and, according to the lower or higher station of the speakers, is the greater or less degradation of the sacred tongue on their lips. If this farrago of languages, which presents such a strange phenomenon in all Hindú plays, were but the idle freak of a poet-pedant, or the wild vagary of burlesque, like the closing scenes of the 'Bourgeois Gentilhomme,' they would have little to tempt the European scholar; but they have another and far deeper interest. These were the spoken dialects of the poet's own time, which were passing to and fro on the lips of men in the street and the bazaar, ere the first Roman eagle had alighted on that Albion whence after ages should summon India's latest and most beneficent conquerors. These dialects are a rich mine of materials to the philologist; for they form the connecting link

between the ancient Sanskrit and many of the spoken dialects of the India of our day; and numberless forms in these modern idioms, which in the wear and tear of centuries have become corrupted and defaced, are at once explained and recoined to the student by kindred words in the Prákrit of the plays. At the same time Prákrit is full of another interest for the student of ancient history; for Prákrit legends have been deciphered on the bilingual coins of the Greek kings of Bactria; and it is also the sacred language of the Jainas of India and the Buddhists of Ceylon, and closely connected with the history of those religions, and the literature in which they embody their ideas.

The Sakoontalá of Kálidása was introduced into our European world by Sir W. Jones, who, some seventy years ago, on his arrival in Bengal, was the first to make the startling discovery that the Hindús had an ancient drama at all. His translation in prose, which was published in 1789, excited more general interest in Europe, than perhaps any similar Oriental translation, if we except the Arabian Nights, and Pilpay, the second Crusoe of our childhood. It was retranslated into several languages, and its beauties at once recognised and admired; and among others, Goethe, with his world-wide sympathies, at once gave his warm welcome to the stranger.*

And yet Sir W. Jones's translation unavoidably gives but a very inadequate idea of the original, for the MS. which he used was of a later recension, and abounded with interpolated scenes, of a later and far inferior workmanship. Professor Williams edited, a year or two since, a complete edition of the original in its genuine form, from a careful collation of MSS., with an ample collection of notes, which embody all the information the student of this branch of Sanskrit literature can require. In the present volume he has given us, from the same uncorrupted text, the first English translation, into prose and verse, of this *chef d'œuvre* of the 'Indian Shakspeare,' and it may now be said for the first time that our language possesses a worthy reproduction of the great classic of Hindú literature. Apart from its merits as a translation, the volume well deserves

Willst du die Blüthe des frühen, die Früchte des späteren
Jahres,
Willst du was reizt und entzückt, willst du was sättigt und
nährt,
Willst du den Himmel, die Erde, mit einem Namen begreifen;
Nenn' ich, Sakoontalá, Dich, und so ist Alles gesagt!

VOL. OVIIL. NO. CCXIX.

our notice for its magnificent external decorations. It is indeed the most sumptuous specimen of decorative Oriental printing that has ever issued from an English press; every page is surrounded with an elaborately coloured border, the designs for which have been copied from various Oriental MSS., which have likewise supplied some splendid illuminations; and every act is illustrated by two beautiful wood engravings. The peculiar features of Indian scenery have been studiously preserved; and the costumes adapted to those of the age of the drama.

Kálidása is the most universal of all the Indian poets; there is none that for a moment rivals him in his own peculiar skill. His is not the power that moves the passions, that can 'purify' the soul by pity or terror; everywhere we trace the gentle languor which tells of the contemplative Hindú. His drama is no *δράμα* of intense reality, where a lifetime is condensed into an hour,—where the spectator sits, as a temporary Providence, to watch the passing characters as they move, each one with his inmost bosom opened and all the machinery of the passions laid bare. Rather is it a languid lotus-land, where we wander from dream to dream; all is cast in an attitude of still-life and repose, as if labour were not man's portion, and life itself but a trance.

The deep sympathy with nature in all her moods, the intense love of landscape and distance, which so strongly distinguishes Indian poetry from its classical contemporaries, is seen in Kálidása in its purest and noblest form; and nowhere do we meet with lovelier paintings of tropical scenes than are to be found in his poems. And yet even here we trace the same gentle reverie which hangs round his portraits of characters; nature is loved as a dream-land, where the woods and mountains are idealised like the rest. They feel with the hero's fortunes, they weep with his tears, they share his joys, as though nature were but the shadow of the soul, and took from thence all its lineaments. One of the early poets of the Veda sings, 'I distinguish not if I am this all, for I go perplexed and bound in mind;' a strange conception for one earlier than Homer, and which at once stamps the true character of the Hindú mind. The same feeling, however modified, runs through all Hindú poetry; nature is loved because it mingles with the dream, and not because, Antæus-like from its contact, the poet wakes afresh to conscious energy and strength.

The earliest specimen of the Hindú theatre is the 'Toy Cart,' ascribed to King Sudraka, which tradition assigns to the

second century before the Christian era. Kálidása, as we have said, belongs to the succeeding century, and is associated with the court of Vikramáditya, whose great victory (B.C. 56) over the Scythian hordes as they pressed onward from Bactria into India, is the starting point of the Samvat era, from which the Hindús still continue to count. Only three of his plays are left, and one of these is of doubtful authenticity; the other, the *Vikramorvasi*, has been beautifully translated by Professor Wilson, in his '*Hindú Drama*,' who has likewise given an admirable version of the '*Toy Cart*.' To his pages we would also refer our readers for translations from two later authors, Bhavabhúti, who flourished A.D. 720, in the Court of Yasoverma, King of Kanoj,—and Visákhadatta, of a yet later date, who has left a quasi-historical play on the legend of Chandragupta, the Sandracottus of the Greeks. Our limits restrict us to the present specimen, and forbid us to attempt any lengthened history of the Hindú Theatre as a whole. Sudraka and Kálidása are the most ancient dramatists whose works have been preserved, as the next, Bhavabhúti, is much more recent; but there is every reason to believe that many earlier plays have been lost. Thus the prologue of the *Vikramorvasi* expressly alludes to the 'compositions of former dramatic bards;' and perhaps among these might be numbered some unknown names which have come down to us as quoted by scholiasts. One evidence of the high antiquity of the drama is, the fact, that the earliest extant specimens presuppose a school of dramatic criticism; and even in the works of Sudraka and Kálidása, we find express allusions to the elaborate technicalities, which correspond in India to our own Aristotelian unities.*

The Hindú drama admits of every variety, from the most idealised heroic type to the coarsest satire and buffoonery; and alike through all, even in its most sustained efforts, there runs side by side with the pathos and tragedy an element of the ludicrous and comic. Schlegel observes that every theatre has its buffoon; and thus the Hindú has its *vidúshaka*, who, like the gracioso of the Spanish stage, accompanies the hero as his confidant and friend, and mocks, with a Sancho-Panza-like grotesqueness,

* An allusion to an acted Hindú drama occurs in Somadeva's '*Ocean of Stories*,' which, though of course valueless as an evidence of antiquity (as this work only dates from the 12th century), is not without its interest as a little glimpse into an old forgotten past. 'While there, we heard the sound of a little drum, and my mother, recollecting her deceased husband, said to me, sobbing, "Your father's friend, the actor Bhavananda, is playing to-day."'

his chief's more elevated sentiments, bringing down in fact the heroics of romance to the vulgar level of common life. A happy *dénouement* is a necessary condition of all Hindú plays; and this law has effectually stifled all the nobler efforts of Tragedy. It is not, indeed, in the dreamy temperament of Hindustan that the true Tragic Muse could ever find a home; she loves a people of strong fibre and resolute will, nursed in danger and storm. With the growth of imperial Athens rose Athenian tragedy, reflecting in its expansion all the contemporary revolutions of thought; and our own old English drama was nursed in the century of the Reformation and the throes of political convulsion.

We now turn to the Sakoontalá, and shall proceed to give an analysis of its story, extracting such scenes as appear peculiarly interesting to the English reader. The story itself is an ancient legend, found in one of those two mythological epics, the *Rámáyana* and *Mahábhárata*, which occupy the place of the Homeric poems in the ancient literature of India, and, like them, contain the storehouse whence succeeding poets drew their materials. Like the royal houses of Thebes and Mycenæ, Indian legend has its Solar and Lunar dynasty of kings; to the latter of these mythic lines the hero of the present play belongs.

The drama opens with a pastoral scene, laid in one of those quiet hermitages which in ancient times were so common in India, whither, as to the monasteries of the middle ages, men of studious habits fled for peace and seclusion, in the midst of the tyranny and oppression which were rampant in the land. It was perhaps in some such retired grove as this, that Alexander found the Gymnosophists, and Onesicratus held that interview with the wise Dandamis, and told him of philosophers among the barbarians, such as Pythagoras, Socrates, and Diogenes — when the Indian replied that ‘they indeed appeared to him to have been men of genius, but to have lived with too passive a regard to the laws.’

Into this peaceful hermitage, King Dushyanta, while engaged in the chase, enters with his chariotceer, in full pursuit of the flying antelope. The voice of one of the hermits suddenly arrests him in his eager pursuit, and forbids him to profane the sanctuary by the blood of one of its dependents. Tenderness to all animal life is a favourite subject in all Hindú poetry.

The king immediately desists, and is invited to partake of the hermits' hospitality. As he walks through the sacred precincts, we have the following beautiful description of the hermitage.

'*King (to his charioteer).* Do you not observe
 Beneath the trees whose hollow trunks afford
 Secure retreat to many a nestling brood
 Of parrots, scattered grains of rice lie strewn.
 Lo! here and there are seen the polished slabs
 That serve to bruise the fruit of Ingudi.
 The gentle roe-deer, taught to trust in man,
 Unstartled hear our voices ; on the paths
 Appear the traces of bark-woven vests
 Borne dripping from the limpid fount of waters.
 And mark !
 Laved are the roots of trees by deep canals,
 Whose glassy waters tremble in the breeze ;
 The sprouting verdure of the leaves is dimmed
 By dusky wreaths of upward curling smoke
 From burnt oblations ; and on new mown lawns
 Around our car graze leisurely the fawns.'

During his stay with the hermits, the king sees and falls in love with Sakountalá, the daughter of Viswamitra, who has been brought up with the maidens of the hermitage ; and we have some pleasing little scenes describing the dawn of passion in the minds of the pair, varied by touches of grotesque humour in the mistress of the gracioso, at his patron's sudden fancy for pastoral pleasures. The lovers are married, but Dushyanta is summoned to his court, and he leaves his bride for the present in the hermitage. The scene that follows we extract entire ; it is thrown artistically as an episode between the acts, and in all the light touches of character and incident we may recognise Kálidása's peculiar skill. Nor must we judge of the incident, on which the catastrophe turns, by our European notions. To us a Brahman's curse is a meaningless sound, but not so to the superstitious Hindú, who even to this day lives in the constant dread of incurring its mysterious anathema. On a Hindú's daily life, in fact, ever rests a continual shadow, the terror of a spiritual interdict, which haunts his steps at every turn. He moves in an enchanted circle, surrounded by invisible spells, his every act encompassed by jealous powers, who watch his minutest transgression of their own arbitrary laws,—laws which he himself is perhaps unconscious of, and can only tell their existence by their effects. Calamity and disease are the penalties of every such transgression ; and the hapless votary wanders from the cradle to the grave, tracked by these inexorable Gorgons of superstition. To such a people the curse of a Brahman comes with an ominous sound ! and these were the feelings, we must not forget, which animated both poet and audience in the present play.

'SCENE*—The Garden of the Hermitage.

'Enter Priyamvadá and Anasúyá in the act of gathering flowers.

'Anasúyá. Although, dear Priyamvadá, it rejoices my heart to think that Sakoontalá has been happily united to a husband in every respect worthy of her, nevertheless I cannot help feeling somewhat uneasy in my mind.

'Priy. How so?

'Ana. You know that the pious king was gratefully dismissed by the hermits on the successful termination of their sacrificial rite. He has now returned to his capital, leaving Sakoontalá under our care; and it may be doubted whether, in the society of his royal consorts, he will not forget all that has taken place in this hermitage of ours.

'Priy. On that score be at ease. Persons of his noble nature are not so destitute of all honourable feeling. I confess, however, that there is one point, about which I am rather anxious; what, think you, will father Kanwa say, when he hears what has occurred?

'Ana. In my opinion he will approve the marriage.

'Priy. What makes you think so?

'Ana. From the first it was always his fixed purpose to bestow the maiden on a husband worthy of her; and since Heaven has given her such a husband, his wishes have been realised without any trouble to himself.

'Priy. (looking at the flower-basket.) We have gathered flowers enough for the sacred offering, dear Anasúyá.

'Ana. Well, then, let us now gather more, that we may have wherewith to propitiate the guardian deity of our dear Sakoontalá.

'Priy. By all means.

[They continue gathering.

'A voice behind the scenes. Ho there! See you not that I am here?

'Ana. (listening.) That must be the voice of a guest announcing his arrival.

'Priy. Surely Sakoontalá is not absent from the cottage. [Aside.] Her heart at least is absent, I fear.

'Ana. Come away, come away; we have gathered flowers enough.

[They move away.

'The same voice behind the scenes. Wo to thee, maiden, for daring to slight a guest like me!

'Shall I stand here unwelcomed; even I,
A very mine of penitential merit,
Worthy of all respect? Shalt thou, rash maid,
Thus set at nought the ever sacred ties
Of hospitality? and fix thy thought
Upon the cherished object of thy love
While I am present? Thus I curse thee then—
He, even he of whom thou thinkest, he

* We may here remark that all these dramas are written in an intermixture of prose and verse.

Shall think no more of thee; nor in his heart
 Retain thy image. Vainly shalt thou strive
 To waken his remembrance of the past;
 He shall disown thee even as the sot,
 Roused from his midnight drunkenness, denies
 The words he uttered in his revellings.

'*Priy.* Alas! alas! I fear a terrible misfortune has occurred! Sakoontalá, from absence of mind, must have offended some guest whom she was bound to treat with respect. (*Looking.*) Ah! yes! and no less a person, I see, than the great sage Durváras, who is known to be most irascible. He it is that has just cursed her, and is now retiring with hasty strides, trembling with passion, and looking as if nothing could turn him. His wrath is like a consuming fire.

'*Ana.* Go quickly, dear Priyamvadá, throw yourself at his feet, and persuade him to come back, while I prepare a propitiatory offering for him with water and refreshments.

'*Priy.* I will. (*Exit.*)

'*Ana.* (*advancing hastily a few steps and stumbling.*) Alas! alas! this comes of being in a hurry. My foot has slipped, and my basket of flowers has fallen from my hand. (*Stays to gather them up.*)

'*Priy.* (*recentering.*) Well, dear Anasúyá, I have done my best; but what living being could succeed in pacifying such a cross-grained ill-tempered old fellow? However I managed to mollify him a little.

'*Ana.* (*smiling.*) Even a little was much for him. Say on.

'*Priy.* When he refused to turn back, I implored his forgiveness in these words: "Most venerable sage, pardon, I beseech you, this first offence of a young and inexperienced girl, who was ignorant of the respect due to your saintly character and exalted rank."

'*Ana.* And what did he say?

'*Priy.* "My word must not be falsified; but at the sight of the ring of recognition the spell shall cease." So saying, he disappeared.

'*Ana.* Oh then we may breathe again; for now I think of it, the king himself, at his departure, fastened on Sakoontalá's finger, as a token of remembrance, a ring on which his own name was engraved. She has therefore a remedy for her misfortune at her own command.

'*Priy.* Come, dear Anasúyá, let us proceed with our religious duties. [*They walk away.*]

'Sec, Anasúyá, there sits our dear friend, motionless as a statue, resting her face on her left hand, her whole mind absorbed in thinking of her absent husband. She can pay no attention to herself, much less to a stranger.

'*Ana.* Priyamvadá, let this affair never pass our lips. We must spare our dear friend's feelings. Her constitution is too delicate to bear much emotion.

'*Priy.* I agree with you. Who would think of watering a tender jasmine with hot water?' [*Exeunt.*]

The months wear on in the quiet hermitage, with the daily round of sacrifices and prayers; but no tidings come from the

King, on whom the Brahman's curse has already wrought its spell. Poor Sakoontalá mourns in silence, and her companions, with sad forebodings, hide the fatal secret close in their hearts. At length the holy Kanwa returns from his long absence, and at once proposes to send his fosterchild to rejoin her husband in his court. Auspicious omens favour the proposal for the departure, and the hermits' grove is suddenly enlivened with cheerful preparations. The scene which follows, — Sakoontalá's farewell to the home of her youth, — is a gem in all Sanskrit literature. It is in such scenes of quiet tenderness that Kálidása's genius excels; nor is he great among his country's poets alone; surely such a scene of quiet beauty as the present would have done honour to any age or clime.

At length the hour for departure arrives; the hermit Sarngarava and Gautamí* head the little band; and all the inmates of the hermitage press forward to bid their beloved Sakoontalá farewell, and conduct her for a while on her way.

'Kanwa. Hear me, ye trees that surround our hermitage!
 Sakoontalá ne'er moistened in the stream
 Her own parched lips, till she had fondly poured
 Its purest water on your thirsty roots;
 And oft, when she would fain have decked her hair
 With your thick clustering blossoms, in her love
 She robbed you not e'en of a single flower.
 Her highest joy was ever to behold
 The early glory of your opening buds;
 Oh then dismiss her with a kind farewell!
 This very day she quits her father's home,
 To seek the palace of her wedded lord.

[*The note of a Kōil is heard.*

Hark! heard'st thou not the answer of the trees,
 Our sylvan sisters, warbled in the note
 Of the melodious Kōil? they dismiss
 Their dear Sakoontalá with loving wishes.

'Voices in the air. Fare thee well, journey pleasantly on amid streams,

Where the lotuses bloom, and the sun's glowing beams
 Never pierce the deep shade of the wide-spreading trees,
 While gently around thee shall sport the cool breeze.
 Then light be thy footsteps and easy thy tread,
 Beneath thee shall carpets of lilies be spread;
 Journey on to thy lord, let thy spirit be gay,
 For the smiles of all nature shall gladden thy way.

[*All listen with astonishment.*

*The superior of the female inhabitants of the hermitage.

' *Gautamí.* Daughter, the nymphs of the wood, who love thee with a sister's affection, dismiss thee with kind wishes for thy happiness. Take thou leave of them reverentially.

' *Sak.* (*bowing respectfully and walking on, — aside to her friend.*) Eager as I am, dear Priyamvadú, to see my husband once more, yet my feet refuse to move now that I am quitting for ever the home of my girlhood.

' *Priy.* You are not the only one, dearest, to feel the bitterness of parting. As the time of separation approaches, the whole grove seems to share your anguish.

In sorrow for thy loss, the herd of deer
Forget to browse; the peacock on the lawn
Ceases its dance; the very trees around us
Shed their pale leaves, like tears, upon the ground.

' *Sak.* My father, let me, before I go, bid adieu to my pet jasmine, the moonlight of the grove. I love the plant almost as a sister.

' *Kanwa.* Yes, yes, my child, I remember thy sisterly affection for the creeper. Here it is on the right.

' *Sak.* (*approaching.*) My beloved jasmine, most brilliant of climbing plants, how sweet it is to see thee cling thus fondly to thy husband, the mango tree; yet prithee, turn thy twining arms for a moment to embrace thy sister; she is going far away and may never see thee again.

' *Kanwa.* Daughter, the cherished purpose of my heart
Has ever been to wed thee to a spouse
That should be worthy of thee; such a spouse
Hast thou thyself by thine own merits won.
To him thou goest, and about his neck
Soon thou shalt cling confidently, as now
Thy favourite jasmine twines its loving arms
Around the sturdy mango. Leave thou it
To its protector; e'en as I consign
Thee to thy lord, and henceforth from my mind
Banish all anxious thought on thy behalf.

Proceed on thy journey, my child.

' *Sak.* (*to Priy. and Ana.*) To you, my sweet companions, I leave it as a keepsake. Take charge of it when I am gone.

' *Both* (*bursting into tears.*) And to whose charge do you leave us, dearest? Who will care for us when you are gone?

' *Kanwa.* For shame, Anasúyú, dry your tears. Is this the way to cheer your friend when she needs all your support and consolation?

[*All move on.*]

' *Sak.* My father, see you there my pet deer, grazing close to the hermitage? She expects soon to fawn, and even now the weight of the little one she carries hinders her movements. Do not forget to send me word when she becomes a mother.

' *Kanwa.* I will not forget it.

' *Sak.* (*feeling herself drawn back.*) What can this be fastened to my dress?

[*Turns round.*]

'*Kanwa.* My daughter,

It is the little fawn, thy foster child. '
 Poor helpless orphan ! it remembers well
 How with a mother's tenderness and love
 Thou didst protect it, and with grains of rice
 From thine own hand didst daily nourish it ;
 And ever and anon, when some sharp thorn
 Had pierced its mouth, how gently thou didst tend
 The bleeding wound, and pour in healing balm.
 The grateful nursing clings to its protectress,
 Mutely imploring leave to follow her.

'*Sak.* My poor little fawn, dost thou ask to follow an unhappy wretch who hesitates not to desert her companions ? When thy mother died, soon after thy birth, I supplied her place, and reared thee with my own hand ; and now that thy second mother is about to leave thee, who will care for thee ? My father, be thou a mother to her. My child, go back and be a daughter to my father.

[*Moves on weeping.*']

There seems to us something peculiarly beautiful in this prophetic close to the scene of sorrow, darkened, as it is throughout, by the spectator's own forebodings of the fatal curse that lowers in the background ; the prescient eye of the sage looks clearly through the cloud, and tracks the long line of sunshine beyond ; and the audience carry with them this glimpse of the far-off future into all the coming sorrow and despair.

The curse has, indeed, been fatally at work, and Dushyanta, returned to his court, has utterly forgotten the quiet pastoral episode. The following scene introduces us to the palace, where the king and his gracioso Máthavya are discovered in conversation : —

'*Máth.* (*listening.*) Hark, my dear friend, listen a moment, and you will hear sweet sounds proceeding from the music-room. Some one is singing a charming air. Who can it be ? Oh, I know. The queen Hansapadiká is practising her notes, that she may greet you with a new song.

'*King.* Hush, let me listen.

(*A voice sings behind the scenes.*)

'How often hither didst thou rove,
 Sweet bee, to kiss the mango's cheek ;
 Oh leave not then thy early love
 The lily's honeyed lip to seek.

'*King.* A most impassioned strain truly.

'*Máth.* Do you understand the meaning of the words ?

'*King.* She means to reprove me because I once paid her great attention, and have lately deserted her for the queen Vasumati.'

The king despatches the jester with a message to the queen,

and, while musing on the incident, bursts out into the following strangely beautiful lines : —

‘Not seldom in our happy hours of ease,
When thought is still, the sight of some fair form,
Or mournful fall of music, breathing low,
Will stir strange fancies, thrilling all the soul
With a mysterious sadness, and a sense
Of vague yet earnest longing. Can it be
That the dim memory of events long past,
Or friendships formed in other states of being,
Flits like a passing shadow o’er the spirit?’

We must refer our readers to the play itself for the beautiful series of scenes which follow: the appearance of Sakoontalá at the court, and her Imogen-like resignation and silent despair at the king’s utter oblivion of the past. The ring, on which so much depended, has unhappily fallen from her finger during the journey, while passing a sacred lake, and, unable to establish her identity, she turns away in silent agony. On her leaving the court, heaven itself interferes in her behalf, —

‘A shining apparition,
In female shape, descended from the skies,
Near the nymph’s pool, and bore her up to heaven.’

The next act (the sixth) opens with a capital scene, which conducts us into the very life of the times; ‘two constables drag in a poor fisherman, who, while cutting open a fish, has found the king’s ring, and has been arrested in consequence on the charge of theft. The refined brutality of the two officers is admirably portrayed as they triumph over their unhappy victim, and revel in his expected punishment. ‘My fingers itch,’ cries one, ‘to strike the first blow at this royal victim here. We must kill him with all the honours, you know. I long to begin binding the flowers round his head.’ When the ring, however, is brought before the king, the spell is suddenly dissolved, and the full stream of his frozen feelings at once thaws in a torrent of grief. An ample reward is given to the fisherman, who generously turns to his captors:

‘*Fisherman.* Here’s half the money for you, my masters. It will serve to purchase the flowers you spoke of, if not to buy me your goodwill.

‘*1st Officer.* Well now, that’s just as it should be.

‘*Superintendent.* My good fisherman, you’re an excellent fellow, and I begin to feel quite a regard for you. Let us seal our first friendship over a glass of good liquor. Come along to the next wine-shop, and we’ll drink your health.

‘*All.* By all means.

[*Exeunt.*]

The King, only too conscious of his loss, now it is beyond recovery, gives himself up to inconsolable regret.

Years pass on (for the Indian drama scorns the unities, like a true daughter of the Romantic school), and the desolate king at last is summoned to aid the gods in a contest with a race of giants, which it is fated that only his arm can bring to a successful issue. He is summoned away from his hopeless remorse into scenes of danger and exertion, and the seventh and last act nobly opens in the sky as he returns earthward in the god Indra's chariot, with Mátali, the heavenly charioteer, by his side.

'*King.* Ah Mátali, we are descending towards the earth's atmosphere.

'*Mát.* What makes you think so ?

'*King.* The car itself instructs me ; we are moving
O'er pregnant clouds, surcharged with rain ; below us
I see the moisture-loving chátakas
In sportive flight dart through the spokes ; the steeds
Of Indra glisten with the lightning's flash ;
And a thick mist bedews the circling wheels.

'*Mát.* You are right ; in a little while the chariot will touch the ground, and you will be in your own dominions.

'*King (looking down).* How wonderful is the appearance of the earth as we rapidly descend.

Stupendous prospect ! yonder lofty hills
Do suddenly uprear their towering heads
Amid the plain, while from beneath their crests
The ground receding sinks ; the trees, whose stems
Seemed lately hid within their leafy tresses,
Rise into elevation, and display

3 Their branching shoulders ; yonder streams, whose waters,
Like silver threads, but now were scarcely seen,
Grow into mighty rivers ; lo ! the earth
Seems upward hurled by some gigantic power !'

At length the car descends upon 'a range of mountains, which, like a bank of clouds illumined by the setting sun, pours down a stream of gold,—on one side its base dips into the eastern ocean, and on the other side into the western.' These are the sacred mountains, beyond the Himalaya, where Kasyapa dwells, the father of gods and men ; and the King resolves to go in person and pay his homage to the holy patriarch, who dwells in a sacred grove, surrounded by the greatest sages, immersed in those tremendous penances, which play so conspicuous a part (as the reader of Southey's 'Kehama' will remember) in all Hindú mythology.

On his way thither he is attracted by a child, whom he sees in rough play with a young lion, which he wrests from its

growling mother, crying, 'Open your mouth, my young lion; 'I want to count your teeth!' The attendants try by promises to lure the boy away from his perilous playfellow; and, as he stretches out his hand for the offered boon, the King reads on his palm those mystic marks which, in Hindú superstition, pre-
sage universal empire.

'*King.* I feel an unaccountable affection for this wayward child.

How blessed the virtuous parents, whose attire
Is soiled with dust, by raising from the ground
The child that asks a refuge in their arms!
And happy are they while with lisping prattle,
In accents sweetly inarticulate,
He charms their ears; and with his artless smiles
Gladdens their hearts, revealing to their gaze
His tiny teeth just budding into view.'

He hastens up to speak to the child, and his answers to his questions confirm his rising hopes; they proceed together to his mother, who dwells in the hermitage hard by. As they approach, Sakoontalá (for it is she) beholds a stranger with her son, and forth she comes,

'Clad in the weeds of widowhood, her face
Emaciate with fasting, her long hair
Twined in a single braid,'

and meets at the threshold—her husband. A few hurried words are exchanged, and all is over and forgiven, and Sakoontalá herself, with a feeling truly Hindú, solves the enigma of destiny.

'Rise, my own husband, rise. Thou wast not to blame. My own evil deeds, committed in a former state of being, brought down this judgment upon me.'

As she stands clasped in her husband's arms, her eyes fall on the fatal ring, which he has worn on his finger since the time of its recovery through the fisherman. Our closing extract shall give the short dialogue that ensues, graceful as it is with all our poet's own tenderness.

'*Sak.* Ah my dear husband, is that the lost ring?

'*King.* Yes, the moment I recovered it, my memory was restored.

'*Sak.* The ring was to blame in allowing itself to be lost at the very time when I was anxious to convince my noble husband of the reality of my marriage.

'*King.* Receive it back, as the beautiful twining plant receives again its blossom in token of its reunion with the spring.

'*Sak.* Nay; I can never more place confidence in it. Let my husband retain it!'

Such is this genuine specimen of the Hindú drama,—a little nook of tender beauty and pastoral peace. The other play, the *Vikramorvasi*, has been translated by Professor Wilson, in his ‘*Hindú Drama*,’ and it well deserves a comparison with the *Sakuntalá*. On both are deeply impressed the author’s peculiar genius; yet the two works are ‘like in difference;’ and if each has traits of resemblance which recall the other’s features and character,

‘*Et similis facies, qualem decet esse sororum,*’

each has also its proper charms, and a definite personality of its own.

We have only cast a passing glance on the difference between the dramas of Greece and India; but the subject is one which would amply repay a closer investigation. Their differences are not only on the surface,—they reach to the deepest springs of thought, and are interwoven with the wide contrast of their histories. The drama of Athens was nursed in freedom; its voice was the echo of the ecclesia; and the eloquence which shook the Pnyx was reproduced in the mimic conflict of human passions on the stage, and everywhere carried with it all Athenian sympathies. But in India thought was chained; and the drama, cut off from reality, became the polished pastime of the court, and languished into an idler’s spectacle. The mixture of dialects at once removed it from the pale of popular sympathies, and limited its enjoyment to the few; nor, indeed, were the mass of the nation at any period refined enough to enter into its delight. Amid the dearth of external incident, we of course know little of India’s inner history,—the secret life of her millions through the long centuries, before the Mohammedan conquests first lifted the veil; but all that we know assures us, that, if the few were educated and refined, the many were sunk in misery and ignorance. The higher castes had their poetry and philosophy, and, while they were true to themselves, enjoyed their refinements and arts; but the mass of the people lived on from age to age hereditary ‘hewers of wood and drawers of water.’ Hence a true national drama was impossible; and Poetry, debarred from reality, and confined to a shadowy past, forgot at last the language of energy and life, and could only sing of shadows and dreams.

ART. XI. — *Parliamentary Government considered with reference to a Reform of Parliament.* An Essay by EARL GREY. London: 1858.

AN Essay by Earl Grey on the established principles of British Parliamentary Government, in connexion with the most important political question of the day, cannot fail to be read with interest and examined with respect. In original abilities and in acquired information, Lord Grey deservedly ranks among the most considerable statesmen of the age. His understanding is shrewd even to subtlety; his power of expression is conspicuous in debate, and perceptible in composition; his industry is indefatigable; and, we believe, that no man ever discharged the duties of a Minister of the Crown with more singleness of purpose, or a more courageous devotion to the public interests. An experience of thirty years, in either House of Parliament, and during some portion of that time in the Cabinet, has given him opportunities of observation which are rarely enjoyed by so philosophical a thinker; and the causes which have removed him from office do not affect the clearness and accuracy of his judgment on public affairs. It is indeed a matter of regret, that a man of so much vigour of intellect and character should be wanting in any of the qualities which are needed to make these faculties conducive to the public advantage; and we hope that the time is not far distant when he may again share the responsible duties of the Executive Government, instead of employing his great talents to increase the difficulties which necessarily surround the administration of an empire.

This volume contains the opinions which Lord Grey thinks it desirable to submit to the attentive consideration of the nation at the present time, on the two important subjects of Parliamentary Government and Parliamentary Reform. Although the second of these topics may acquire, and indeed has acquired, a paramount interest from its immediate effect on political parties, and its ultimate effect on our whole political condition, yet it should ever be remembered that Parliamentary Government is the permanent object to which all measures of Parliamentary Reform are, or ought to be, directed — that Parliamentary Government includes all that is most essential to the mechanism of the State and to the maintenance of freedom — and, indeed, that the ultimate value of changes in the Parliamentary Representation of the people, can only be ascertained,

when their effect on the government, carried on under their influence, is known by experience. The triumph of the Reform Act of 1832 consists not so much in the recognition of certain abstract principles, or in the readjustment of the franchise, as in the fact that for a quarter of a century Parliamentary Government has been established in this country with greater purity and efficiency than it ever possessed before,—that during this period innumerable measures of unequalled public importance have been adopted in rapid succession by the Legislature; and that whilst discord has shaken, and despotism subdued, almost every other great nation in Europe, the people of England have never been more heartily attached to their institutions, or more happily at peace amongst themselves. Whilst, therefore, we cordially admit the wisdom and the justice of an extension of the representative system on a scale proportioned to the advancement of knowledge and the diffusion of property, the maintenance and practice of the true principles of Parliamentary Government itself appear to us to be objects of still more vital consequence. The experience of the last few months has demonstrated, in a manner not to be mistaken, that here lies our present danger and our present duty. We have seen a Government raised to power by the triumph of a disciplined minority over the dissensions of the majority; we have seen the dissolution of a great party professed as a science and practised as an art; discontent and insubordination have, for the moment, reduced the Liberal party to a condition scarcely less distracted than that into which the opposite party fell by the great schism of 1846; and though we shall abstain on this occasion from all personal recrimination on the causes which have led to this untoward result, we must take this opportunity of expressing the strongest conviction that it is only by a speedy return to a sounder discipline and by a more earnest adherence to the real objects of the Liberal party that these reverses can be retrieved. The immediate and inevitable result of this state of things has been the inversion of all the principles and maxims on which the government of this country has hitherto been conducted in the House of Commons. The Tories are in place, but the Radicals are in power. Ministers are content to accept their measures from their opponents, or to extract them by a new process from the blind throes of the Legislature: and so little can they lay claim to the title of Conservative Statesmen, that they have not made an effort to rescue their own responsible authority, as Ministers of the Crown, from the insidious attacks of their exulting allies. We unaffectedly believe that the principles of Parliamentary Government have already received con-

siderable injury from the anomalous position and reckless proceedings of Lord Derby's administration, and we gladly embrace this opportunity to remind our readers of the truths on which these principles appear to us to rest.

It is, therefore, to considerations arising out of the subject of Parliamentary Government, and not to the question of Parliamentary Reform, that we propose, on this occasion, to direct our attention; both because these appear to us to form the most valuable portion of Lord Grey's essay, and also because we are glad to take this opportunity of dealing with some fallacies and misrepresentations which have lately obtained a certain degree of popularity. Before we enter on the main purpose of these observations, we shall, therefore, cursorily dismiss that part of Lord Grey's volume in which he discusses the question of Reform.

It must be acknowledged that these chapters leave no very clear or definite impression on the mind. At the very outset Lord Grey declares his opinion to be that no partial measure of Reform is likely to be carried, or, if carried, to prove beneficial to the nation; he therefore contends, 'That the best and safest course will be to attempt a complete revision of our representative system,' though the country is not at present prepared for so large a measure; he recognises 'the necessity, and even the urgent necessity, of amending our Constitution;' he argues against any partial or comparatively small alteration in the existing right of returning members to Parliament. But he makes these statements without any indication of the nature of the 'complete revision' which he would undertake; he expressly approves of the irregularities existing in the representation of the people; and he declares himself decidedly adverse to schemes of Reform based on the mere principle of democratic extension.

'The only sound principle on which constitutional changes can be attempted, is that of directing them to practical improvement of Government, and to the removal of evils that have been felt, not to the gratification of men's passions, or their love of change. But if this principle is recognised, it follows that a new Reform Bill ought not, like the former one, to aim at the transfer of a large amount of political power from one class of society to another, since this is no longer necessary in order to protect the general interests of the country from being sacrificed to those of a minority of its members. It is not, however, to be inferred, that no Reform of our Representation is required, because there is no occasion for altering the existing distribution of political power among different classes of society. A Reform is wanted, though not for the same reasons as formerly. In the present state of things the objects which ought to be aimed at by

such a measure are, to interest a larger proportion of the people in the Constitution, by investing them with political rights without disturbing the existing balance of power; to discourage bribery at elections, without giving more influence to the arts of demagogues; to strengthen the legitimate authority of the Executive Government, and at the same time to guard against its being abused; and to render the distribution of the Parliamentary franchise less unequal and less anomalous; but yet carefully to preserve that character which has hitherto belonged to the House of Commons, from its including among its members men representing all the different classes of society, and all the different interests and opinions to be found in the nation. Much public good might be anticipated from the passing of a new Reform Bill having these for its objects; but it would be far otherwise with one of which it should be the design or the effect to render the House of Commons more democratic in its character, since, in the present state of society, it can hardly be doubted that any increased power given to the democratic element in our Constitution must end, sooner or later, in its complete ascendancy. Though strongly convinced of the value of free institutions, and a firm friend of popular liberty, I am yet persuaded that such a change in the character of our Government would be one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall our country.' (P. 127-9.)

We are utterly unable to reconcile these positives and these negatives—these promises and these warnings—nor does Lord Grey furnish us with the key to his enigma. To abide by the settlement of 1832 is one intelligible course. To advocate the adoption of partial and not unfrequent measures tending to extend and complete the system of representation, so that it keep pace with the extension of knowledge, the acquisition of property, and the changes occurring in the habits of the population, is another intelligible course. But to prescribe a 'complete revision of the representative system,' which is to leave all the essential characteristics of the present system unaltered, to strengthen the executive authority, and to withhold increased power from the democratic element, is a task which must be left to the ingenuity of Lord Grey himself. Such a suggestion might come, and possibly will come, from 'Vivian Grey' much more naturally than from any other Grey who has figured in our history; and we confess we cannot willingly accept these discouraging remarks from the son of the author of the great Reform Bill. In fact the only proposal he has made in this volume is but a small instalment towards the solution of so difficult a problem. He recommends that,—

'The Queen should nominate a Committee of her Privy Council, composed of members taken from different political parties, to consider and adopt what measures of reform should be adopted;' and he adds, that 'a well-selected Committee of Council might inquire, as well as

a Commission, into the best mode of reforming our representation, while it would also afford the means of discovering what measures could be carried, if it had among its members some of the leaders of all the great parties in the State, not excluding the Radical party,—some of whom might, with great propriety, be made Privy Councillors for the purpose.'

In other words, this eclectic committee would supersede the Executive Committee of Council of the day, which is commonly called the Cabinet, in one of the most important of its functions; and it would probably differ from the Cabinet in this respect, that as we have already seen, that the objects of Lord Grey's Reform Bill are multifarious and contradictory, so the opinions of this Committee would be extremely diversified, both as to the objects of the measure, and as to the means of effecting those objects: and their scheme would be totally discredited before it saw the light, because a scheme so framed (if framed at all) by men of opposite views must be a compromise of every shade of opinion. It may be a difficult thing to paint a good picture, but Lord Grey commences by rubbing together all the colours on the palette in one confused and unmeaning mixture. (On the fate of a measure so recommended to Parliament, it is unnecessary to enlarge; but the mere fact that this extravagant proposition can have been deliberately published to the world by a man of Lord Grey's undoubted ability, denotes the perplexity actually prevailing in many minds on the true nature of the relations between the Legislature and the Government. We are of course utterly unacquainted with the views of Her Majesty's Government, but if we were to hazard a conjecture on this subject, we should venture to predict that if the duration of the Ministry is prolonged to another Session, the country will be startled by the strange apparition of a Tory Reform Bill. Mr. Disraeli has already given more than one indication of what is passing in his mind on this subject; and since Reform of Parliament has been promised by every party in the State, he may argue that the interests of his party render it expedient to effect such a Reform in the Tory sense,—that is, by a large extension of the influence of the landed interest through the counties, and of the Radical party in the boroughs—a measure tending as far as possible to swamp the most educated classes in the nation, and to change the relations of the Executive Government and the Legislative.

The advocates of Reform may be divided into two classes, whose principles and whose objects are essentially distinct. One of these classes, to which Lord Grey and the whole Whig party unquestionably belong, desires above all things the main-

tenance of that system of Parliamentary Government which has so long promoted the order and well-being of this country, and which they believe to have secured to it a greater share of real freedom than has ever fallen to the lot of any people. With this object in view they recommend the extension of the suffrage, and the removal of the abuses which time or corruption may have introduced into the Constitution; and they are prepared to carry these changes as far as they can be carried without sensibly altering or impairing the adjustment of the powers by which the different functions of government are performed. But this condition establishes a natural limit beyond which they are not prepared to go. For this purpose they are studious to maintain that which Lord Grey has well pointed out as one of the peculiar characteristics of the British Constitution, namely, the principle which identifies the leaders of the majority in the Legislature with the executive servants of the Crown. It is not altogether true in theory, and it is certainly untrue in practice, that the whole executive power of this country is exercised by the Crown or its Ministers, nor is it true that the whole legislative power is exercised by Parliament; for, on the one hand, Parliament exercises a continual control over the acts of Ministers in their administrative capacity, and, on the other hand, the measures adopted by the Legislature are to a considerable extent regulated by the propositions submitted to it by Ministers. These distinct functions of government are connected by the fact, now thoroughly established in practice, though not by any legal provision, that the Ministers of the Crown are the same men who, for the time being, enjoy the confidence of the House of Commons. This proposition, however, involves several other considerations, which become in turn essential conditions of the existence of such a form of government. The Ministers of the Crown must be members of one or other House of Parliament, and they must be men who possess, in the assembly to which they belong, a degree of influence and weight commensurate to the executive duties they undertake to perform. They derive this influence and weight mainly from the support of their party, that is to say, from the systematic adherence of men attached to the same political principles, contending for the same objects, and united in an organised body. To maintain the existence of such a body, unity and direction are requisite on the part of the chiefs, consistency and discipline on the part of their adherents.

‘The possession of this species of authority,’ as Lord Grey observes, ‘is what gives its peculiar character to Parliamentary, as compared to other forms of Representative government, and it is also what has

enabled the House of Commons to become distinguished from other popular assemblies, by the steadiness with which it generally acts, and by its seldom allowing itself to be led into rash and inconsistent decisions. At some periods the power of the Crown in Parliament has doubtless been excessive, so as occasionally even to threaten to deprive the nation of the real enjoyment of political liberty; but it is not the less certain that it is of the very essence of Parliamentary Government, that the servants of the Crown should possess some considerable power within the walls of the House of Commons, and that hitherto they have obtained this power through the irregularities of its composition. Had all its members been returned by such constituencies as Westminster and Yorkshire, it must be plain to the most careless observer, that the working of the Government, as it has hitherto been carried on, would have been impracticable.' (P. 62.)

It is the rooted and time-honoured conviction of the great majority of Englishmen, that the Constitutional Monarchy under which we live is a better guardian for the peace, order, and freedom of this nation, than any form whatever of purely republican or democratic government. What do we mean by this Monarchy, and why do we maintain it? Is it a mere sham, an empty show, an antiquated tradition divested of all true meaning? On these sentimental grounds the stability of the throne would indeed be precarious, if it ever ceased to be strengthened as well as adorned by the virtues of the reigning Sovereign. But we hold that it rests on a broader and more solid basis: it is the permanent representative of the great public interests of the nation, public justice, public faith at home and abroad, national defence, public honours,—things which cannot be subject to the fluctuating control of popular assemblies; and whilst it is of the essence of free government, that the men who advise the Sovereign in the discharge of these duties should be responsible to Parliament for the performance of their duties, those duties could not be adequately performed if Ministers had not large powers beyond the walls of Parliament for the execution of them, and large powers within the walls of Parliament for the defence of them. On no other conditions can we conceive that the Monarchy itself, as it has existed for the last 170 years in this country, can be upheld.

Those, therefore, who desire the efficient maintenance of the existing system of Parliamentary Government in this country, do, in other words, desire that the executive power should be vested in the hands of statesmen nominated by the Sovereign, and enjoying her confidence, but practically raised to the position which entitles them to that confidence by the support of the strongest party in Parliament and in the country. To attain this primary object, they must be prepared to make the sacri-

fices which party organisation requires—to reconcile minor differences of opinion—to waive secondary interests—to act as component parts of one great whole, on which the systematic administration of public affairs depends—and to regard with the utmost distrust those, who by plausible appeals to individual differences of opinion seek, in reality, to loosen the foundations of the whole fabric. But without such an executive power it must be clearly understood that there is no Parliamentary Government—perhaps we may go even further, and assert, that there is no government at all. The Emperor Napoleon said, in speaking of the constitutional government which it was proposed to establish in the Hundred Days, that double forces are necessary to steer a ship, since the course of a vessel depends on the joint action of the propelling power and the helm; but that a skiff propelled by a single force was a mere balloon, driven by the wind, without direction and without control. Nothing can be more just than this illustration, confirmed alike by reason, analogy, and experience. Where the supreme power is vested in one hand or in a single body, it is uncontrolled; where it is vested in two distinct bodies, control becomes contradiction; and, as has been repeatedly seen, one power devours the other. The essence of Parliamentary Government, as it is understood in this country, is the practice, which identifies the leaders of the majority in the Legislature with the responsible officers of executive authority in the Cabinet.*

* The principle of English Parliamentary Government, which requires that the principal officers of the Executive Government should also be the leading members of the Legislature, and the chiefs of a legislative majority, imposes on them a double set of functions and responsibilities. In their executive character they are directly responsible for the exercise of powers confided to them by the Crown; but in their legislative character they are also held responsible for the introduction of suitable measures of legislation, and for the success of the measures so introduced. A minister who failed to carry the legislative proposals of the Government was, according to the stricter practice of former times, considered to have forfeited the confidence of Parliament as much as if he had incurred its actual displeasure by an act done in his executive capacity. Yet in point of fact, these responsibilities are altogether different in their nature and extent: a minister may fairly be held to give a strict account of the executive power he wields; but no minister in these times can be said to possess a power approaching to absolute control over the Legislature. He enjoys at most the power of influencing strongly the decision of the majority, and it is not always reasonable to hold him to have incurred a forfeiture of the Executive Government by reason of his inability to determine the course of legislation. There is accordingly a tendency

This theory may be said to culminate in the person of the Minister of the day who fills the position of leader of the House of Commons, for whether he happens or not to hold the highest office in the service of the Crown, the extreme importance of his duties in relation to the most popular and powerful branch of the Legislature, places him incontestably in the first rank of the Ministry. It is, we think, impossible to deny that the strength and efficiency of a government—the support it obtains from Parliament—the respect it obtains from the country—the success of its measures, and the duration of its power, depend more on the character, energy, tact, and judgment of the leader of the House of Commons than on any other individual. A commander-in-chief is not more essential to an army than a leader and chief to a public assembly. It is a total fallacy to imagine that a body of this nature can successfully perform its political duties, or even prolong its own existence in the absence of a competent head. The Legislative Assembly of France, from 1848 to 1851, undoubtedly included a very large proportion of the talent and patriotism of the nation; yet its existence was contemptible and its end inevitable. Ministries have been formed in this country like those of Lord Grenville in 1806, and of Lord Aberdeen in 1853, which contained all the political ability of the time, yet the want of a powerful head rendered them less effective than cabinets of far inferior aggregate power which possessed that essential condition. In proportion as a popular assembly throws off the direction of its own chiefs, it forfeits the confidence of the country, and it loses all power of consistent and beneficial action. A party without a leader degenerates into a party without a principle; and this is especially true of the liberal party in this country, which tends, by its very nature, to greater freedom of speculative opinion than its opponents, and embraces a wider range of private differences. These differences may readily find a vent in the freedom of debate, but until they are combined for a common purpose and by a common direction, they serve only to neutralise one another, and they utterly fail to promote any of the true objects of government.

By way of example, let us apply this remark to one of the most important functions of the House of Commons—that function, indeed, from which all its powers are derived, and in

to greater latitude in our parliamentary practice in this respect, and in proportion as this species of responsibility has decreased, we witness more abortive measures, and the business of legislation is conducted with less vigour and success by the Government.

the exercise of which its authority is unquestionable — we mean the control of the revenue and expenditure of the nation. Even on this subject, the action of a popular assembly is liable to become capricious, inconsistent, and unjust, unless it be regulated and controlled by ministerial power. The impulse and disposition of the House of Commons is at once to reduce taxation and to promote expenditure; the duty and interest of a Chancellor of the Exchequer is to maintain taxation, in as far as it is necessary for the public service, and to reduce expenditure. The weaker a Government may be, the more prone will it become to purchase support by the surrender of unpopular fiscal burdens; but the less power will it have to resist those ever-recurring demands, which tend year by year to enlarge the public outlay. Innumerable examples of this species of contradiction will occur to the recollection of every reader; for unhappily the precarious tenure of governments, and the shifting state of parties, have of late years materially increased this evil. To resist it, we require a Minister strengthened by the support of a powerful party, and therefore able to defend taxes which are always unpalatable, and sometimes unpopular, as well as to resist claims on the public purse which are plausible and attractive. The maintenance of public credit, the defence of the country, and the first duties of government, depend on this condition; but it may be questioned whether any popular assembly ever existed sufficiently wise and self-denying to resist, by its own resolution, the fatal alternations of ill-judged economy and lavish expenditure.

When the activity of the House of Commons is not skilfully directed by the influence of a competent leader to the business of legislation and the discussion of practical measures of improvement, the same forces and powers which ought to be usefully employed in transacting the business of the country, are in fact wasted in debates absolutely injurious to the public interests. Hence the increasing disposition of Parliament to deal with momentous questions in the form of abstract propositions, called resolutions, having in reality no binding authority on the Government or on the House itself, and tending to lower the Legislature to the level of a debating society, in which opinions are not unfrequently expressed with the more vehemence, from the certainty that they may be expressed without fear of any practical consequences. Upon a recent occasion in the House of Lords, Lord Grey remarked that 'if the House of Commons passed resolutions hastily, and without perhaps taking the opinions of those members on both sides who are most capable to advise it, it must be prepared to find such

'resolutions become a dead letter and remain so with the ap-
'probation of the country.' And this remark has since been
enlarged by Mr. Disraeli to a distinct rule of constitutional
practice, because it suited him to disregard Major Vivian's suc-
cessful proposal on the administration of the army. Such in-
stances have unhappily become not unfrequent, and whilst they
tend to embarrass the Government and Parliament in dealing
with the same questions hereafter, they more seriously impair
the consistency and authority of the House of Commons. The
truth is, that when a large public assembly abandons itself to the
veering impulses of debate, without direction and without con-
trol, its time is wasted and its energy mispent. Its movements
are as sterile and unceasing as the movement of the waves, and
after long nights of tossing controversy and endless words, it
turns out that nothing has been effected. If any man will
take the trouble to review the records of our parliamentary
debates from February to July in this present year, or to
ask himself what part he may have played in those scenes, he
may perceive by what follies and passions the interests of an
empire may be sacrificed to the divisions of an assembly.

These are elementary propositions on which it might seem to
be altogether needless to insist, were it not that recent experience
has on several occasions shown that these principles are losing
their hold on the modern House of Commons, and that a theory
of a totally opposite nature has apparently been adopted by at least
one section of modern political writers. According to this theory,
as we find it set forth in an essay entitled 'Party Government,' in
the last number of the 'Westminster Review,' party government
is at an end, and the nation, as distinct from public men and
from the journalists, is unanimous in desiring its overthrow;
that the ideal of a constitutional Ministry would be a Ministry
forced to obey Parliament, instead of commanding it*; that, for

* The same opinion has been expressed in the House of Commons
itself. Thus Mr. Milner Gibson observed, on the 30th April, that
whilst he congratulated himself on that piece of mischief which ended
in the destruction of the Conspiracy Bill of the late Government, he
thought 'that the time was approaching when Parliament would
'more and more advise Ministers, and when Ministers would less and
'less dictate to Parliament.' To this Lord Palmerston replied,
'Honourable Gentlemen may have more or less confidence in the
'Government that now occupies the Treasury bench; they may think,
'with the Right Honourable Gentleman who has just sat down, that
'the more Government needs, from its own inherent weakness, the
'assistance of Parliament, and the more it is therefore compelled to
'take Parliament into its councils, the better.' In a subsequent
debate Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Bright carried the same doctrine still

this purpose, the weaker a Ministry is, the more certain it is to obey the impulse given by the nation through Parliament, and a weak Government is therefore preferable to a strong one; that in order to secure this end, it is desirable that Cabinets should be composed of men of various opinions, who should not be bound to act on the same principles, or, in the event of defeat, to share the same fate; that the Ministers of the present day should bear the same relation to Parliament as the members of the Privy Council of Queen Elizabeth did to that sovereign, being united by no tie but the common fear of their arbitrary and implacable mistress; that ministerial responsibility means absolute subservience to the policy which Parliament commands, and that the Executive be kept separate from, and subordinate to, Parliamentary authority; and that as all official men are a just object of distrust, the first duty of constituencies is to reject in their choice of representatives the statesmen who seek to combine the duties of an Executive servant of the country with those of a member of Parliament.

These opinions may astonish many of our readers, since they evidently involve a total revolution in the existing principles of government of this country, and the introduction of what would be in fact a pure republican authority. But we refer to this production of our Radical contemporary, chiefly because it presents in a bold and naked form the ultimate results of certain practices and opinions which have of late manifested themselves in the House of Commons, and which we hold to be dangerous to the best interests of freedom itself. Unhappily for the result of the experiments to which the country and Constitution have recently been subjected by the more original and inventive minds of the Liberal party, whilst they were repudiating authority, denouncing party combinations, and passing over to the enemy, the Tories set them a memorable example of what may be effected by parliamentary discipline. Not content with one revolt, which had the effect of placing Lord Derby in power, a second outbreak has prolonged his tenure of office; and the puerile ebullitions or vindictive passions which have now thrown the destinies of the Empire into the hands of an incom-

further: they distinctly arrogated to the House of Commons a supreme power, and they boasted that the extreme Radical party was far more likely to extort its ends from the weakness of the Tories than from the strength of the Whigs. On these conditions Lord Derby appears to have obtained and accepted this unnatural alliance.

petent Ministry, are exalted into a theory which would place all executive power at the mercy of a floating section of politicians. The Ministers, on the one hand, would hold place without power; the Chiefs of the House of Commons, on the other hand, would enjoy power without responsibility.

The Constitution of the United States has evidently suggested some of these political innovations: there the line between the Executive Power and the Congress is sharply drawn by the exclusion of the President and his Ministers from both chambers of the legislature, and by withholding the power of dissolution; but, on the other hand, the authors of that Constitution carefully avoided making the Executive dependent on the Legislature of the day, and in order to give some permanence and stability to that important branch of the government, they provided that the Head of the Administration should be elected for four years by the people, and invested with the full power of choosing his own ministerial agents. In one sense, as M. de Tocqueville has remarked, this provision gives the President of the United States more direct and independent power than can safely be exercised by the sovereign of a constitutional monarchy in Europe; but, on the other hand, it greatly diminishes the authority of the government in Congress, and it may happen (as has recently been seen in the Kansas controversy) that the two branches of the national power adopt and follow opposite lines of policy, which practically neutralise each other.

This expedient of the entire separation of the two powers was doubtless invented by the founders of the American Commonwealth, in obedience to the great maxim of constitutional government, that no freedom can permanently exist, unless there be a division of authority. All the writers on the institutions of this country, from Blackstone to Lord Grey, have pointed out this fundamental principle of our liberties, on which it is needless to insist. It pervades not only the general system of our institutions by the severance of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial power; but in each of these branches it may again be traced. The united assent of the two Houses of Parliament and of the Crown is required to sanction a law; the united co-operation of several of the multitudinous branches of the administration is required to carry almost every measure of the government into effect; the united decision of the judge who finds the law and of the jury who find the facts is required to procure a conviction or sustain a judgment in our Courts of Law. No doubt it has been shown by Mr. Bentham and his followers, that it is untrue to assert that these powers

are equally balanced; on the contrary, a supreme authority in the last resort does always exist somewhere, but this supreme authority is not constant in its origin or direct in its operations; and the structure of the British Constitution, like the adaptation of mechanism to the distribution of physical forces, owes its chief excellence to the happy combination of infinite varieties of action, with as much unity of purpose as the interests of a free nation admit of or require.

It is therefore with great surprise, and we confess with some apprehension, that we witness the prevailing outcry of the day against what is termed 'double government' — a phrase borrowed from the peculiar constitution of the East India Company and the Board of Control — and the growing impatience manifested by a certain section of politicians, both in the House of Commons and in the country, against every thing that checks or impedes the direct action of what they are pleased to term the national policy. This is neither more nor less than the theory of unblushing despotism. The Emperor of the French may with some show of reason claim to be the representative of the national policy of France, since a vast numerical majority of the people of that country voted for his election and ratified his usurpation. That principle being established on the broad basis of universal suffrage, every thing else, every other institution, every law, every right, bends before it; and the logical propensities of the French mind are satisfied by the total abasement of the nation before a single idea. But every page of English history, and every spark of English-feeling, protests against so monstrous a conclusion; though, with a degree of inconsistency for which it is difficult to account, there is an undoubted disposition, especially in the ranks of the Radical party, to claim and exercise, in the name of the House of Commons, an exorbitant power in the State, to treat the Executive Government as a slave or a foe, and to extend this power, which is already so considerable at the expense of the other institutions of the country.

No doubt one of the greatest constitutional questions of the day is as to the extent of the interference of the House of Commons in the Executive Government of the country. Lord Grey justly reckons among the advantages of Parliamentary Government

'That which it derives from the manner in which it brings the policy of the Executive Government under the review and control of the Legislature. Parliament does not interfere directly in carrying on the Executive Government; and it is right that it should abstain from doing so, since experience has demonstrated the unfitness of large deliberative assemblies for this function. But every measure of the Ministers of the Crown is open to censure in either House; so

that when there is just or even plausible ground for objecting to any thing they have done or omitted to do, they cannot escape being called upon to defend their conduct. By this arrangement, those to whom power is entrusted are made to feel that they must use it in such a manner as to be prepared to meet the criticisms of opponents continually on the watch for any errors they may commit, and the whole foreign and domestic policy of the nation is submitted to the ordeal of free discussion.' (P. 21.)

This is the true constitutional doctrine and the proper function of Parliament. But to enable the Minister to justify his conduct, and to maintain his position against these interrogations or attacks of opponents who are seeking to try his actions and to overthrow his authority, it is indispensably necessary that he should have the support of a party, prepared on general grounds to accept their share of the responsibility of his conduct. In reality it is in the independent exercise of the large executive powers vested in the Crown, that the true responsibility of Ministers consists. Responsibility is always proportionate to freedom of action: where a man acts for another on his own convictions, and in the exercise of his own judgment, he owes to his principal an account of his actions, which may be approved or condemned. But where an agent acts under the direct authority of another and superior power, if there is obedience there is not responsibility. Responsibility attaches to the Minister of a free State; but the same expression cannot apply to the mute who obeys the signal of a tyrant, or to the officer who performs, perhaps, against his own wishes, the mandate of a convention.

Yet this is the condition to which the theory of government we just now adverted to would degrade the Executive Power, and this object is to be accomplished in two ways—first, by inspiring a vulgar jealousy of those who hold employment under the Crown; and secondly, by exalting to a paramount and irresistible authority those who represent the popular element in the Constitution.

The best practical result of any system of political institutions is to place the Executive Power of the nation, which obviously cannot be directly exercised by the nation at large, in the hands of men of the highest character and the best abilities. They should be men looking to the public good rather than to private advantage; sufficiently independent in their judgment to originate or adopt a progressive system of policy, sufficiently independent in their position to resist the exactions of the sovereign or the impulses of the people, when these are at variance with the permanent interests of the State. Perhaps the

proudest distinction and the happiest circumstance in the administration of this country is, that for a long period of time its Ministers and official men have belonged to a class which, as a whole, fulfils these conditions. It may be questioned whether at any given moment the country possesses men more capable of an efficient exercise of power, than those who on the benches of the Treasury, or the benches of Opposition, are actually contending for the possession of it. If (as may well happen) there are men in other spheres of social life equally qualified to serve their country, the lists are open to them, and by passing through the same Parliamentary probation, they may arrive at the same position. We say this state of things is a distinctive characteristic of British Parliamentary Government, because we know from experience that it is not attained by other forms of government. It is not attained by absolute monarchies, because the service of the State involves such a sacrifice of independence, and sometimes of character, that the proudest and purest minds recoil from the yoke: thus we have seen the present Emperor of the French assume without opposition all the powers of unlimited monarchy, and dispose absolutely of the liberties of the nation, but he has utterly failed in the attempt to attach to the councils of his Executive Government any man of intellectual superiority or moral worth. It is not attained by democracies; for in the United States it is notorious that men like Franklin Pierce have been invested with the supreme magistracy of the Commonwealth solely on the ground that they served to keep out men of loftier pretensions and more definite political convictions; the ablest and best men in the Union stand aloof from politics altogether, and the noblest duties of social life are abandoned to adventurers of lower passions and narrower opinions.*

Hence, as Lord Grey has pointed out from several authorities, a rapid decline is apparent in the politicians of America, and there is not an American statesman in existence who can be said to represent the illustrious founders of the Republic. 'When the United States contained only three millions of

* In the State of Wisconsin it has recently been proved before a Commission of Inquiry that the whole Executive Government, the Legislative, and the Press of the State have suffered themselves to be deliberately bought by a Railway Company — the Governor receiving 50,000 dollars, the Senators 10,000 each, the Representatives 5000 each, and the Newspaper Editors corresponding sums; upwards of 800,000 dollars had been expended in this scandalous transaction.

‘inhabitants, they produced generals, statesmen, philosophers and orators, whose fame will live as long as the English language. Now there is not a single man of distinction among their twenty millions. Every President has been inferior to his predecessor.’ Such was the sentence uttered by Signor Manin, the wise and courageous defender of Venetian independence; and though we should hardly have ventured on so sweeping a conclusion, the tendency to deterioration in the public men of America is incontrovertible.

It is not true that mere ambition is a sufficient incentive to the first men in any community to take upon themselves the arduous and often ungrateful duty of administering public affairs; still less is it true that the mere personal advantages of office, which are often as hardly earned as the emoluments of laborious professions, or even the wages of a day-labourer, present invincible attractions to men of independence, of character, and fortune: and if the Ministers of the Crown are of all men to be least free to act upon their convictions and their sense of public duty, it is easy to perceive that their places will be filled by men who pursue the highest objects from the lowest motives. In other words, the class of British statesmen would deteriorate—a result the most fatal to the true interests of the Empire, and which would speedily have the effect of bringing Government itself into public contempt.

Yet such is the dangerous tendency of that extreme section of politicians, who are seeking on the one hand to make the Executive Government the mere instrument of the popular will, and on the other hand to exclude from popular elections all those persons by whom the administration of affairs has been, or may be, carried on. ‘To serve God and Mammon,’ says our contemporary, ‘is not harder than to combine the duties of a Minister of State and of a Member of Parliament. . . . The constituencies must insist on the independence of their representatives. If, on this ground, most of them absolutely refused to elect an official, they would soon enforce a total change.’ They would undoubtedly effect a total change; for as every ‘official’ is subject to re-election on acceptance of office, if every constituency were on this principle to reject its former representative, no member of Parliament could take office, or, taking office, he would cease to be a member of Parliament. Hence that link which Lord Grey has shown to be the essential connexion between the Parliamentary and Executive powers would be broken, and Parliamentary government, as it has existed in this country for 150 years, would be at an end. The progress of an English commoner to the highest offices in the State depends on

three conditions : a constituency of his fellow-citizens must send him to Parliament, the House of Commons must accept him as a distinguished member of its own majority, and the Crown must summon him to the exercise of power. Can any thing be more absurd than that the first of those conditions should be denied, because the other two are likely to be fulfilled, and that a constituency should refuse to send an able man to the House of Commons, because his talents expose him to the imminent danger of serving his country in a higher capacity ?

But extravagant as these propositions appear when candidly set down upon paper, they undoubtedly do actuate a certain portion of the constituencies and the representatives of this country : and our object in noticing them is to show that their ultimate effect would be absolutely fatal to our whole system of government. They rest upon the false assumption that there is something radically opposed in the idea of Government and the idea of Parliament, as if the national objects of every form of power were not identically the same. The division of the two powers is not to counteract, but to control each other ; and the policy of the country is the result of their joint action : but the effect of this theory of conflict would be first to annul the whole power of the Executive Government by the authority of the House of Commons ; and then, the authority of the House of Commons being supreme and undivided, to direct the whole policy of the State by that power alone : this would obviously be to create a republican form of government of the most absolute kind, and to substitute an intolerable tyranny for a limited power. Yet this is the certain tendency of those who are continually endeavouring to overthrow or undermine the Executive Government, whether they agree with its principles or not ; who, under the specious pretence of independence, spurn the obligations of party ; and whose only article of faith seems to be that the common ruler is the common enemy. We remember to have asked a leading member of the French opposition, about the year 1846, what was the object of the violent course he and his friends were pursuing ? ‘ *Détruire le plus de Gouvernemens que nous pourrons,* ’ was the answer ; and this policy was followed with such remarkable success, that within two years the Monarchy and all Parliamentary Government was at an end ; and within five years France was living under the closest despotism in Europe. Every one in this country can perceive the suicidal absurdity of the proceedings of the French Opposition of that day : but the application of the same principle to some of the votes of the House of Commons against Lord Palmerston’s Administration is not less direct ; and the contemptible artifices by which those

adverse votes were obtained are the very counterpart of the proceedings in the Chamber of Deputies in the case of Mr. Pritchard and the Right of Search Treaties.

But the objects of these standing adversaries of Executive Government would not be attained merely by bringing the Ministers of the Crown into a state of helpless dependence, and by making them the objects, first of jealousy, and at last of contempt. The next step is to assume for the House of Commons itself, or for its committees, a more direct action over the policy and measures of the Executive Government. So that the comparison stands thus: a Cabinet consisting of twelve or fourteen Members of Parliament, Peers and Commoners, chosen because they have the confidence of a majority of the House of Commons, and are the ablest men in that majority, united by political principle, each of them being responsible to his colleagues and to Parliament for one department of administration to which he is bound to devote all the energies of his mind, is to be regarded with the utmost jealousy and suspicion by 'independent' members; they are instantly to combine, with its avowed opponents, in censuring the smallest error—if it be an error—whether of omission or of commission; and if they succeed in effecting its ruin, they have the satisfaction of bringing into power another Cabinet, which being only the representative of a Parliamentary Minority, lives by its inherent weakness, and knows, like Scheherazade, that it may at any moment be ordered for execution; so that while one minister is hateful for his power, his successor is honoured for his subserviency, and interesting from his debility. Take on the other hand a body, consisting of about the same number of Members of Parliament, nominated on the principle that they are men of the most opposite views, owing to each other no confidence and no support; responsible to no one, and not even bound to hear the evidence on which they are to vote; let this body be called a Select Committee, controlling the decisions of the Executive Government, and exercising, often without control, the authority of the House of Commons, and you will then realise the sort of authority to which an omnipotent democratic assembly would probably refer the most arduous questions of national policy.

Lord Grey draws this distinction between Executive and Parliamentary authority very broadly:—

‘Any direct interference on the part of either Houses of Parliament with the management of the Army would undoubtedly be a direct violation of the principles of the Constitution; but the same observation applies to every branch of the executive authority. The Long Parliament, by its Committees, assumed various executive functions;

but its doing so is admitted to have been a usurpation, and since that time the rule has been recognised in theory and in practice, that all such functions belong only to the Crown. This rule is quite consistent with another not less important, namely, that either House of Parliament is entitled to offer its advice to the Crown on the manner in which any of its powers are exercised, and that there can be nothing done by the royal authority for which some servant of the Crown must not be responsible to Parliament.'

In point of fact, however, the rule Lord Grey lays down is still recognised in theory, but not in practice. The House of Commons continually interferes in the executive functions of Government, and sometimes in the minutest of them: such as the purchase of a picture or the site of a building, the scale of the Ordnance survey, the choice of agents at home and abroad, the distribution of honours; not to speak of higher questions of policy and administration, such as those which the Sebastopol Committee affected to decide in the middle of a campaign. It may here be remarked that this species of interference, which is eminently useful to control and check the abuses of power, is by its nature of a negative rather than a positive character. It can prevent anything, but it can perform little or nothing. Hence on several subjects of national interest we have frequently seen measures of great public utility indefinitely postponed or defeated, because the power of resistance exceeds by many degrees the power of action. No more striking example of this defect can be quoted than the discreditable history of the drainage of the metropolis; a question which is simply one of science and finance—for no one disputes the importance of the required object—has been bandied about from Select Committees to Commissioners, and from one Board to another, until by a just retribution the halls of the legislature and the committee-rooms at Westminster are contaminated by the nuisance they have failed to remove, simply because the executive authority has not been resolved to produce and carry through some definite plan of action. Nor does the evil end here. It has moral results which we deeply deplore. Invidious contrasts are suggested between the prompt and effective operations of despotic power and the working of free institutions, and by some superficial minds the immeasurable value of those institutions is misjudged because they are misapplied to objects they cannot accomplish. In such cases a popular assembly defeats the purposes of its own existence.

Nothing is more remarkable than the tender forbearance with which the House of Commons treats its own Select Committees, though, if their proceedings were strictly canvassed, there are

perhaps few parts of our system of government which can less support criticism. As a means of inquiry and investigation, they are of the highest value, and they are constantly carrying on with great success the political education of Parliament and of the nation: but when they strain at executive authority, they generally fail; nor can their judicial impartiality (except in peculiar cases) be entirely relied on. One portion of the business of Parliament approaches very nearly to the duties of actual administration—we mean the business of private bills, by which public works and private investments of capital are in this country to a great degree regulated. The subject has more than once been discussed in these pages; but we again confidently affirm that if any branch of the Executive Government had committed the same amount of blunders and inconsistencies, had tolerated the same amount of fraud and injustice, and had sanctioned the same immoderate outlay, which has been the result of Parliamentary proceedings on Railway Bills, that branch of the Executive Government would justly have incurred the execration of the public. This example is valuable, because it illustrates, with great force, the truth of a remark we made a few pages back, that responsibility depends on free agency and divided authority. The responsibility of Parliamentary Committees on private bills is altogether illusory: for they owe no account of their proceedings, except to the body to which they belong, and from which they derive their power. Had similar powers been exercised by an independent Board, they would no doubt have been viewed by Parliament with great jealousy; they would have been effectually controlled; and if such a Board abused its power, it would have been overthrown.

Thus then we find, that whilst one section of the advocates of Parliamentary Reform at this time desires to extend the franchise, and to purify the representation only so far as may be consistent with the maintenance of the existing system of Parliamentary Government, another section of Reformers is seeking to demoralise the House of Commons, and at the same time to extend its powers. Probably a large majority of the Liberal party, including certainly the most eminent and enlightened of its members, would concur with us in declaring that the former of these alterations is the object of their policy; and that ulterior changes such as those we have shown to be contemplated by the Radical party, do in reality tend to a species of absolutism rather than to freedom. Yet the relaxation of party discipline in the House of Commons, and the disposition to view with favour the existence of a weak government, chiefly because such a government can only exist by humouring a majority on which it

has no claim for steady support, is an important step towards the reduction of ministerial influence and executive power. No one can doubt that although Lord Grey's opinions may be unwelcome to the Radical party, and are openly opposed to ultra-democratic reform, he is one of the most consistent and unflinching advocates of free government—alike free from prejudice and from fear. His judgment on this subject, therefore, deserves to be noted :—

' The possession of political power is valuable to the people, not for its own sake, but as the means of ensuring good government. Their real interest therefore is, not that they should have the largest possible share of power, but that they should have such a measure of it, and that the Government should be so constituted, as to afford them the best security for its being well conducted. And a Government is to be considered as well conducted when wise laws are passed and impartially enforced; when public employments are placed in the hands of honest and capable men; when the relations of the State with foreign nations are managed with firmness and a regard for justice; and when every member of the community is effectually protected against wrong from every quarter, without unnecessary interference with the freedom of thought or action on the part of individuals, or undue or unequal pressure of taxation. A Government is to be considered better or worse in proportion as it more or less perfectly fulfils these conditions; and adopting this as a test, good government has not been found, either in ancient or in modern times, to be the result of extreme democracy. . . . In France, and in some other European countries, those brief periods during which unrestricted democracy has obtained the ascendancy in the last seventy years, have afforded examples of abuses and excesses singularly like those which are described as having followed democratic revolutions in ancient times, and have led, much in the same way, to the extinction, for a time at least, of political liberty. The United States of America afford the most favourable example of the working of a purely democratic system of government, during any considerable period, in modern times. But its results, even in that great and flourishing Republic, seem to me to confirm the unfavourable conclusions of ancient writers, whether we look to the working of the general government, or of the governments of the several States composing the Union. . . . Various evils are traced, by the best observers, to the unbalanced power of democracy. It is the form of government in the United States, not the people, that is to blame for them; since the high qualities of the American people at the time of the revolution are universally admitted, and probably have alone enabled so ill-constituted a government to be carried on at all. Such is the experience we have of the working of an unbalanced democracy in America, and those who have closely watched public events of late years, must surely have already observed significant symptoms that its operation in this country (should it ever unhappily be established here) would be even worse, and that we must expect it to give a disastrous ascendancy, in the conduct of public

affairs, to demagogues who would make the worst use of their power.' (P. 129-40.)

Unhappily, the course of revolutions and the impulses of the human mind are such, that after having established popular power in the name of public liberty, the next step is to sacrifice public liberty itself, in order to escape from the intolerable abuses of popular power. Nothing is more discouraging to the real friend of human progress than the violence of this reaction. Were it not passing before our eyes, it would be incredible that a nation like the French, who have made three great revolutions in seventy years for the establishment of freedom, should deliberately submit to the bondage of the Empire, in order to escape from the terrors of that popular party which overthrew the constitutional monarchy in 1848. Even in England it was the violence of the reaction against the Commonwealth which induced the nation to submit for twenty-eight years to the most profligate and degraded sovereigns who have ever sat on the throne. And although we do not question that the love and practice of free government, free action, and free thought is more deeply rooted in this nation at the present time than in any other part of the globe; yet when we consider the immense national and private interests which would be placed in jeopardy by the undue ascendancy of democratic power over the other institutions of the country, we entertain no doubt that the reaction would surpass and subdue the revolutionary force, though at the expense, perhaps, of some of the dearest privileges we now enjoy.

In one portion of this essay Lord Grey has expressed an opinion, which appears to us so mischievous and discreditable to the cause of free government, and of British Parliamentary Government in particular, that we cannot pass it over in silence. He thinks (p. 38.) that whereas 'corruption is as it were an accident in other forms of free government,' 'Parliamentary Government derives its whole force and power of action from the exercise of an influence which is at least akin to corruption. The possession and exercise, by the Ministers of the Crown, of a large measure of authority in Parliament, is the foundation upon which our whole system of government rests; while this authority has from the first been maintained principally by means of the patronage of the Crown, and of the power vested in the Administration, of conferring favours of various kinds on its Parliamentary supporters.' He adds, 'that it would be idle to deny that it still continues to be one of the chief sources of the moving force by which the action of the political machine is maintained.' Though shortly afterwards

he materially qualifies this assertion, by stating that 'although there never has been a Parliamentary Administration which has not owed some part of its strength to the exercise of an influence more or less corrupt in its character, it is certain that in these days (and probably it was true even in the worst times) no minister can stand exclusively, or even principally, by such means; nor has corruption so large a share as some cynical writers would make us believe, in carrying on the government of this country.' It would appear from the preceding passages that one of the 'cynical writers' to whom this remark applies is Lord Grey himself.

But although it is historically true that a corrupt use of patronage has sometimes been made by Parliamentary Ministers, we are convinced, in direct opposition to the opinion of Lord Grey, that this abuse is one of the weaknesses of Parliamentary Government, and not a true source of its strength. It may here be observed in passing, that the corrupt use of the distribution of patronage is not, as Lord Grey intimates, a condition peculiarly connected with the authority exercised by British Ministers in Parliament. In the United States, the President and his Ministers possess no authority in Congress, and do not derive their power from the support of Congress; yet party influence and corruption in the distribution of patronage are more universally recognised in America than in any other country, since at every change of administration every place in the public service is vacated for the express purpose of satisfying the voracity of the Presidential supporters, and the traffic in votes is notoriously carried on within the very walls of the capitol. Even the diplomatic service of the United States is openly converted into a convenient instrument of public corruption by means equally injurious to the morality of the nation and to its foreign interests. But does Lord Grey suppose that in despotic governments, where the whole patronage of the State is at the undisputed control of the Government, men are less apt to be bought, and Ministers less ready to buy them, because there is no public assembly, and no free press to call them to account? Does he imagine, that because the Ministers of Louis Philippe were loudly accused of the abuse of patronage, and therefore checked in the commission of that offence, if they were guilty of it, the Ministers of the Empire exercise the same patronage with greater purity because they are not responsible to a free Parliament? No such supposition can be maintained. Influence of this illicit kind is denounced and checked under Parliamentary Government, but it is exercised on a far larger scale under other forms of government, where no such check exists. If the patronage of the

Crown and the power of conferring favours were really the mainspring of Parliamentary Government, as Lord Grey asserts, what is the mainspring of the party in opposition? Not the mere hope of distant favours and advantages, for they may be indefinitely deferred or extremely remote. Yet it is notorious that men contending for their principles in opposition are commonly more closely united and far better disciplined than those who enjoy the favours and emoluments of office. The real source of the force and power of Parliamentary Government lies not in these things, but in an honest confidence in a good cause and a capable leader. Veneal support is, after all, but sham support; and no party can stand which is not actuated by earnest convictions directed to a practical object.

But this is not all. In England, at the present time, when the public attention is much directed, and very properly and beneficially directed, to the distribution of patronage, we hold it to be certain that a Minister loses more than he can gain by every deviation from the best use of it. To give a place to one man, or to promote the *protégé* of one member of Parliament, is commonly to give offence to half a dozen competitors, who think that their vote is worth just as much in the market as that of their more successful colleague, if the appointment is to be determined by influence. The effect of such transactions is well described in the pointed language of a French minister, who said, on bestowing a favour for some such consideration, 'J'ai fait dix mécontents et un ingrat.' But an appointment resolutely given to merit, or bestowed on public grounds, in opposition to private solicitation and interest, ought to excite no jealousy or resentment; and every such appointment obtains for a Minister, in the form of public gratitude and respect, ten times the strength he could derive from making it the means of a parliamentary bargain, discreditable alike to him who gives and to him who receives. If we might presume to tender a recommendation to Ministers engaged in conducting the business of Parliamentary Government in this country, and anxious to maintain its just authority, we would entreat them to deal, on broader and higher principles, with this duty of patronage in the selection of public servants. No action is more welcome to the people of England than the recognition of merit for advancement; no action is more fatal to a Minister than the suspicion that offices in the State have been filled for personal or mere party motives. To raise the standard of purity and honour among public men, in the discharge of this national trust, is a far more laudable policy than to make the traffic in places the mainspring of parliamentary power; and we hope to

see the day when it will be thought as shameful to confer an office unworthily, as it is to speculate with the balances in a public account. Competitive examination has been resorted to, and is just now much in fashion, as a means of correcting these abuses but its operation is in reality unfair, because the success of a candidate depends not so much on his own attainments as on the relative attainments of the other competitors. The same individual may be certain of an appointment if sent up with two blockheads, who would be defeated if he came in contact with two men who had enjoyed better means of education than himself. No doubt the introduction of a preliminary examination is a positive gain to the public service; but no examination can test several of the most essential qualities of official life; and for this reason academical examinations are of less value than official probation, where that can be had. But this mechanism may lead in turn to abuses not less serious than those of indiscriminate patronage; it is by no means applicable to the higher class of offices, which are the most important, or indeed to any stage of promotion beyond admission into the service; and we should see with regret the introduction of any system which should release the Minister of the day from the responsible duty of *selection*, which is one of the most important of his public functions.

These views, however, do not materially differ from those which Lord Grey himself expresses in his chapter 'On the Exercise of Patronage under Parliamentary Government;' where he admits that the strict control under which the exercise of patronage has been brought, and the reduction of its amount, have had 'an important, and upon the whole, a highly beneficial effect on the working of our Parliamentary Government,' though not unmixed with some inconvenience: an opinion entirely at variance with the monstrous proposition that Parliamentary Government derives its whole force and power of action from the exercise of an influence at least akin to corruption, which we have previously cited from a former chapter of this book. Hasty and contradictory assertions of this kind are unluckily of frequent occurrence in Lord Grey's productions, and they materially detract from the confidence we should otherwise be disposed to place on his acuteness.

We have endeavoured to point out in these pages some of the causes which have contributed to bring about a temporary state of public affairs which we greatly deplore, and to exhibit in their true light the fallacies by which this state of things has in some quarters been justified and defended. The results we have witnessed in the course of the past Session of Par-

liament are precisely those we anticipated rather more than a year ago, if on the one hand union and organisation were not restored to the phalanx of the Liberal party, which is still infinitely the most powerful party in Parliament and in the country, and if on the other hand the Government of the day did not actively, resolutely, and earnestly persevere in that career of progress which the Liberal party is entitled to expect. The Tories have taken advantage of the mistakes of their opponents, and by a daring and unscrupulous abandonment of their own distinctive principles, they have for a time acquired and retained office on the condition of assenting to the very measures they had combated and impeded when in opposition. But these measures have been carried by a sacrifice of principle and a dislocation of the regular operations of Parliamentary Government which materially detract from their value, and must eventually recoil on the heads of their authors. We trust, however, that the lesson of the last few months will not be lost on the country, and that at no distant period the representatives of those principles which have extorted acquiescence and submission from their bitterest opponents, will again find themselves united as the supporters of a government formed on a broader basis and prepared to achieve fresh victories in the cause of freedom.

No. CCXX. will be published in October.

052 EDI
VOL. 108 (Pt.)
Newspaper Jeffersonian Public Library
Accession No.

7526

Date

23. 7. 75

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OCTOBER, 1858.

No. CCXX.

ART. I.—*Memoirs of the Court of England during the Regency, 1811-1820. From Original Family Documents.* By the Duke of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS, K.G. 2 vols. 8vo. : 1856.

IN a former article we followed the history of the Ministerial changes which occurred in this country between the resignation of Mr. Pitt in 1801, and his death in January, 1806; and we showed how, at the renewal of the war with Bonaparte, after the Peace of Amiens, there was a general wish among the leading statesmen for the formation of a comprehensive Administration, independent of party connexions; which wish was frustrated by the King's refusal to admit Mr. Fox into the Cabinet.* As the exclusion of Mr. Fox from the counsels of the King involved the refusal of Lord Grenville and his friends to join the new Government, the second Administration of Mr. Pitt never acquired the strength which his first Administration maintained throughout its long existence, and at his death it lost not only its principal, but almost its sole, element of vitality.

The King, indeed, made an attempt to infuse a posthumous life into Pitt's Ministry after the death of its founder and chief. The first step which he took upon this event was to authorise the Home Secretary, Lord Hawkesbury, to form a new Administration. Lord Hawkesbury requested a short time for consideration, and then declined the task. But though he did

* Edinburgh Review, vol. cvii. No. 217.

not now feel himself equal to the enterprise of succeeding Mr. Pitt in the more arduous and honourable part of his functions, — though he could not claim the inheritance of Elijah's mantle, — he secured for himself, during this brief interval, the lucrative sinecure of Warden of the Cinque Ports, which Mr. Pitt's death had rendered vacant. A statement has been preserved by Mr. Horner that Pitt's remaining colleagues endeavoured to induce Lord Wellesley, who had recently returned from India, to assume the office of Prime Minister, at the head of the existing Cabinet, but that the offer was instantly refused.* Lord Wellesley was at this time under the threat of impeachment for his acquisitions of territory in India, and his acceptance of a high Ministerial office would probably have been the signal for a repetition of Hastings's trial. If any overtures were really made at this crisis to Lord Wellesley, it is certain that they were not backed by any royal authority.

The King was by this time too well aware of Lord Sidmouth's hopeless incapacity, to entertain any idea of falling back upon his assistance; and his next step, taken by the advice of his late Ministers†, was to send for Lord Grenville, to whom the royal message was conveyed on the 26th of January, three days after Pitt's death. Lord Grenville repeated to the King his previous opinion as to the advantages of a comprehensive Administration, not founded on a principle of exclusion. In answer to the King's inquiry as to the persons whom he proposed to include, Lord Grenville stated at once that the person whom he should consult was Mr. Fox. 'I thought so, and meant it so,' was the King's reply. The result of this interview must be considered as a conclusive proof that Pitt might have obtained the same concession from the King, if he had resisted the exclusion of Mr. Fox in 1804; and that, however strong were the King's objections to particular men or measures, he would, when his position became untenable, yield to constitutional pressure.‡

* Life of Horner, vol. i. p. 332. In a letter to Mr. Wilberforce, dated Jan. 24. 1806, the day after Pitt's death, Lord Wellesley states that 'he knows nothing of public arrangements, and all the reports in the newspapers respecting himself are utterly groundless.' He adds: 'Having no personal object of pursuit, I shall not easily be deluded from the solemn conviction of my mind, that our recent loss cannot be repaired, nor our imminent perils be averted, otherwise than by an union of the approved talents and highest characters of the nation.' (*Pearce's Memoirs of Lord Wellesley*, vol. ii. p. 389.)

† This fact is stated by Lord Sidmouth. (*Life*, vol. ii. p. 414.)

‡ In a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham, of March 16. 1809,

On this occasion an entirely new Administration was formed, and it was composed in the following manner:— Lord Grenville was First Lord of the Treasury, with Lord Henry Petty (now Marquis of Lansdowne), who had established an early reputation as a statesman and orator*, as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Fox was Secretary of State for the Foreign Department, and leader of the House of Commons; Lord Spencer and Mr. Windham held the seals of the other two Secretaries; and the late Lord Grey, as Lord Howick, was First Lord of the Admiralty. The Great Seal was first offered to Lord Ellenborough, with the view of appointing Mr. Erskine his successor as Chief Justice, but was declined. It was then proposed to Sir James Mansfield, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, but this great legal prize was again refused, and Erskine ultimately became Lord Chancellor. Lord Fitzwilliam was President of the Council, Lord Sidmouth Privy Seal, and Lord Moira Master of the Ordnance. These ministers, together with Lord Ellenborough, the Chief Justice, formed the Cabinet. Lord Sidmouth was at this time the leader of a party in the House of Commons which numbered forty or fifty votes, and although the King did not venture to try the experiment of a second Addington Administration, and probably had no desire to see Lord Sidmouth's weight thrown into the scale of the new Government, yet Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox, like Mr. Pitt, found themselves compelled by Parliamentary exigencies to admit him into their Cabinet, meanly as they thought of his abilities, and widely as they differed from his opinions. Lord Moira's appointment was acceptable to the Prince of Wales, and Lord Ellenborough was made a Cabinet Minister, as being the political friend of Lord Sidmouth. It seems that Lord Sidmouth first proposed Lord Buckinghamshire, but that he was objected to by Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox, and that the other arrangement was substituted. The view taken of the position of the two latter Ministers in this Cabinet is expressed in the complimentary remark of one of Lord Sidmouth's correspondents, who likened him, with

Lord Grenville says, in reference to the affair of the Duke of York and Mrs. Clarke: 'The King's mind is, I believe, more difficult to satisfy. He holds out, as he has always done, just as long as he thinks his perseverance is likely to be of any use in carrying his point; and when he sees there is no longer any hope of that, he will give way, as he has always done in such cases.' (*Court and Cab. of George III.*, vol. iv. p. 333.)

* See the very favourable opinions of him expressed at the time, recorded in Horner's Correspondence, vol. i. p. 300. 330.

Lord Ellenborough by his side, to 'a faithful old steward with 'his mastiff, watching new servants, lest they should have some 'evil designs against the old family mansion.'*

The only terms which the new Ministers made with the King related to the management of the army. They contended for the principle that the army should cease to be subject to the direct control of the Crown, through the Commander-in-chief. This proposition was resisted by the King; but his objection was removed by an agreement that no change should be introduced into the government of the army without His Majesty's approbation.† Notwithstanding the King's known scruple respecting his Coronation Oath, no attempt was made to come to any understanding with him on the subject of the Catholic Question. Like their predecessor, Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox were compelled by the King's obstinate prejudice, and by the general state of opinion in the country, to allow the question to remain in abeyance, and to abstain from all attempts at using the Ministerial influence for removing the disabilities of the Catholics.‡ It seems that when Lord Sidmouth accepted office in this Cabinet, he gave Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox express notice, that 'whether in 'the present or future reign, in or out of office, he would ever 'resist to his utmost the Catholic Question.'§ They were therefore precluded, by the very terms of their incorporation, from taking any active step in the matter.

There was another point which was made the subject of preliminary negotiation at the formation of this Ministry, though not with the King. Lord Wellesley had, as we have already stated, then recently returned from India; his aggressive policy,

* Life of Sidmouth, vol. ii. p. 417, 418. 422.

† Life of Sidmouth, ib. p. 415.; Life of Horner, ib. p. 334.

‡ Mr. Fox's difficulties on the subject are explained in his letter to Mr. Grey, 19th April, and to Lord Grenville, 20th April, 1804. (Mem. of Fox, vol. iv. p. 45. 47.) In 1803, Lord Grenville stated to Mr. Pitt, as an essential condition to his taking part in any Government, 'that we should be at liberty to explain to the King in 'the most distinct, though at the same time most respectful, manner, that whenever the Catholic Question might be proposed in Parliament, we reserved to ourselves the full liberty to state and urge 'in debate our unaltered opinions in favour of that measure.' (*Court and Cab.*, vol. iii. p. 286.) This reservation of the right of speech implies that all idea of action was then abandoned. Mr. Fox speaks of Pitt's 'hydrophobia upon the Catholic Question,' to Mr. Grey, 28th March, 1804. (Ib., vol. iii. p. 457.)

§ Life, ii. p. 416.

and his system of territorial acquisition, had involved him in a violent conflict with the Court of Directors, and some preparatory proceedings had been taken in Parliament with a view to his impeachment. The person most active in these proceedings was a Mr. Paull, who had resided for some years in India, and had carried on trade in that country as a private merchant. On his return to England he purchased a seat in Parliament, and employed his Indian knowledge in attacking the late Governor-general, who, having (to use the expression of Sir J. Mackintosh) 'sultanised' his office, had now exchanged his imperial throne at Calcutta for the levelling and censorious atmosphere of London. Anticipating the prosecution of these charges, Lord Grenville (who had been the early friend of Lord Wellesley) stipulated with Mr. Fox that the accusation of Lord Wellesley should not be made a Cabinet measure, and that no person should be appointed President of the Board of Control who should promote it in his official capacity. Mr. Fox assented to these terms, but reserved the power of supporting the accusation if it were brought forward by a private member.* A resolution criminatory of Lord Wellesley was submitted to the House of Commons in the following April, by Mr. Paull; but it was opposed by Mr. Fox, and the motion was withdrawn. The subject was, however, followed up; further charges were made, particularly with respect to Oude; evidence was heard at the bar of the House; but the dissolution in October, 1806, deprived Mr. Paull of his seat. When Parliament reassembled, Lord Folkstone resumed the attack, with a view to censure, not to impeachment; in the following session he moved resolutions which were negatived, and a vote approving of Lord Wellesley's conduct was agreed to by the House.†

Shortly after the announcement of the Ministerial arrangements, the appointment of Lord Ellenborough to a seat in the Cabinet became the subject of animadversion in both Houses of Parliament. The resolution of censure was negatived without a division in the Lords, and by a large majority in the Commons. Parliament, therefore, must be considered to have affirmed the doctrine which was then broadly laid down both by Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville, that the Cabinet has no organised or cor-

* Life of Horner, vol. iii. p. 335.

† Lord Folkstone's motions were on Jan. 26. 1807, and March 9. 1808. With reference to the Oude charge against the late Governor-general, Sir S. Romilly says in his 'Diary,' that he had read the voluminous papers printed for Parliament, and that the conduct of Lord Wellesley appeared to him to be unjustifiable. (Vol. ii. p. 236.)

porate character, that it is not a body recognised by the constitution; and that however complete the moral responsibility of each member for the acts of the Administration may be, yet legally and constitutionally each Minister is only responsible for his own acts, and for the management of his own department.* Opinion was nevertheless unfavourable to an arrangement which involved the Chief Justice, the highest criminal judge, in the party politics of the day; it has never been since repeated, and is not likely to be hereafter revived.†

The most memorable events in this short-lived Administration were the negotiations with France and the death of Mr. Fox.* Shortly after Mr. Fox's accession to office, the offer of a Frenchman to assassinate Bonaparte caused him to communicate directly with the French Government, and the communication thus made presented an opportunity for opening a negotiation for the restoration of peace. This negotiation, which was subsequently pursued by Lord Yarmouth, then a prisoner at Verdun, and by Lord Lauderdale, as plenipotentiaries, at Paris, led to no result; the practical experience of Bonaparte's policy thus acquired convinced Mr. Fox that peace with him was impossible, and that the active prosecution of the war by England was inevitable.‡ We have recently had occasion to state that

* Lord Macaulay's description of the origin and character of the Cabinet (*Hist. of England*, vol. i. p. 211.) agrees with this view. He remarks, that 'it still continues to be altogether unknown to the law. The names of the noblemen and gentlemen who compose it are never officially announced to the public. No record is kept of its meetings and resolutions, nor has its existence ever been recognised by any Act of Parliament.' The joint moral responsibility of the Cabinet is however recognised by Lord Macaulay, *ib.* p. 273.

† Compare the statements in Lord Brougham's '*Statesmen*,' vol. ii. p. 191., as to Mr. Fox's doubts, and Lord Ellenborough's own subsequent disapprobation, of this measure.

‡ The adoption of a warlike policy by Mr. Fox during this Administration is alluded to by Walter Scott in the introduction to the first canto of '*Marmion*':—

'If ever from an English heart,
O, here let prejudice depart,
And, partial feeling cast aside,
Record that Fox a Briton died!
When Europe crouched to France's yoke,
And Austria bent, and Prussia broke,
And the firm Russian's purpose brave
Was bartered by a timorous slave;
Even then dishonour's peace he spurned,
Her sullied olive-branch returned,

almost his last words to one of his most intimate friends and colleagues, enjoined on his survivors the vigorous prosecution of the war. Near the end of the session his health yielded to the distressing effects of dropsy. He was forced to withdraw first from his Parliamentary, and next from his official, duties; and on the 13th of September he expired.

Lord Holland had heard that the King could hardly suppress his exultation at Mr. Fox's death.* But we happen to know, from the certain testimony of the late Duchess of Gloucester, who was with her father when the message was delivered, that the King expressed not satisfaction, but regret; and that he added the remark, that the country could then ill afford to lose such a man. The assurances which Mr. Fox gave to the King on accepting office appear to have removed much of His Majesty's prejudice against him†; and his subsequent conduct to the King confirmed this favourable impression. The biographer of Lord Sidmouth, after inserting a letter written by the latter on the day after Fox's death, in a tone of regret and esteem‡, proceeds to say:—

‘Mr. Fox's powers of attraction must have been extraordinary indeed, to overcome, as they did, not only the feebleness of Lord Sidmouth's political prepossessions, but also the more deeply rooted predispositions which were believed to prevail in the royal mind. But that such was the case is unquestionable. “Little did I think,”—said His Majesty to Lord Sidmouth, at the first interview with which he honoured him after that fatal event,—“little did I think that I should ever live to regret Mr. Fox's death.” His Lordship used to remark that “Mr. Fox was always peculiarly respectful and conciliatory in his manner towards the King, and most anxious to avoid every question which did not harmonise with His Majesty's conscientious feelings.” In proof of this, he mentioned that Count Stahrenberg said to Mr. Fox, when he first came into

Stood for his country's glory fast,
And nailed her colours to the mast.’

The ‘timorous slave’ is M. D'Oubril, whose treaty, signed at Paris with the French Government, was repudiated by the Emperor Alexander. In the words ‘Prussia broke’ there is an allusion to the battle of Jena, which involves an anachronism; for this battle did not take place until October, 1806, after Mr. Fox's death.

* Mem. of Whig Party, vol. ii. p. 49.

† See Wilberforce's Correspondence, vol. ii. p. 76.

‡ In this letter Lord Sidmouth says: ‘Of his talents there can be but one opinion. His natural disposition deserved, I really believe, all that could be said in its favour. I never knew a man of more apparent sincerity; more free from rancour or even severity; and hardly any one so entirely devoid of affectation.’

office, "Have you no difficulty respecting the Roman Catholic Question?" To which he replied, "None at all: I am determined not to annoy my Sovereign by bringing it forward."**

The death of Mr. Fox, not less unexpected than that of Mr. Pitt at the beginning of the year, completely altered the position of the Ministry. But the changes of office proposed by Lord Grenville, and assented to with remarkable graciousness by the King, preserved the balance of power in the Coalition Government. Lord Howick succeeded Mr. Fox as Foreign Secretary and leader of the House of Commons; Mr. Grenville became First Lord of the Admiralty; Lord Fitzwilliam resigned the Presidency of the Council, and was succeeded by Lord Sidmouth; Lord Holland was appointed to the Privy Seal. In this state the Ministry met Parliament for the following session on the 15th of December, 1806, a dissolution of Parliament and a general election having taken place during the recess. Both Houses, after full debate on the recent negotiations with France, concurred unanimously and cordially in the vigorous prosecution of the war; and business was proceeding in its usual course, when in the month of February a series of communications with the King commenced which led to the fall of the Administration. The Cabinet decided to introduce into the Annual Mutiny Bill a clause enabling the King to confer military commissions on any of his subjects, without distinction of religion; the object being to permit Catholics to hold commissions in the army. The King first assented to this clause, but afterwards changed his mind, and withdrew his assent. The Ministers acquiesced in his refusal; but he proceeded to require from them a written declaration, that they would propose to him no further concession to the Catholics. This assurance they declined to give, and the resignation of their offices was forthwith accepted.

Thus ended, in March, 1807, after a duration of about fourteen months, the nearest approach to a Whig Administration which was in power during the forty-seven years between 1783 and 1830. The King had never given it a cordial support, and he dexterously availed himself of the earliest opportunity which his Ministers afforded him for bringing about a rupture, and driving them to resignation. In the negotiation respecting the clauses in the Mutiny Bill, and the objections which he took, he appears to have received assistance from some skilful adviser; nevertheless he informed Lord Eldon and Lord Hawkesbury, in his interview with them on the 19th of March, that he had

communicated with no one—not even with the Archbishop of Canterbury.* As no agreement with the King was made by the Ministers on their accession to office respecting the Catholic Question, they could not justly complain of his objection, if it was confined to the present, and did not relate to prospective measures. They made, however, a large concession to his antipathy against the Catholics, in complying with his desire that their limited measure should be withheld: and having deferred so far to the King's prejudices, they could not reasonably expect to be exposed to the test which he now required them to subscribe, or to be arrested by the barrier which he now erected across their path. This was the second Administration which the King had turned out upon the Catholic Question. The same question was destined, many years afterwards, in the consequences of its final settlement, to be fatal to a third Ministry.

Lord Sidmouth had differed from his colleagues during the final negotiation with the King, and had tendered his resignation to Lord Grenville, but it was suspended; and he, together with Mr. B. Bathurst and Mr. Hiley Addington, accompanied the rest of the Government into retirement. The King made this distinction between Lord Sidmouth and his colleagues, that he gave him alone an audience of leave; and afterwards addressed to him a gracious letter, thanking him for his services. Lord Sidmouth, on this occasion, although he considered the newly formed Government as extremely feeble, remarked that 'it was the King's Government, and he would never be a party to a systematic opposition.' His course, he laid it down at the same time, would be 'to support the King, and to resist any motion the tendency of which would be to throw an imputation on His Majesty's conduct, or to control the just exercise of his prerogative.†

* For a history of this negotiation see Lord Holland's *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. ii. p. 173–205., with the documents in the Appendix. Any person who is acquainted with the peculiar style of George III. will perceive that his letters of February 10th and 12th, and of March 17th, were not composed by himself. As the King was at this time nearly blind, the letters were probably composed by Sir Herbert Taylor. Further information is also furnished by the letters of Lord Grenville and Mr. Grenville in *Court and Cab.*, vol. iv. p. 117–121. 134–146.; the account in *Wilberforce's Life*, vol. iii. p. 306.; and Lord Malmesbury's narrative, vol. iv. p. 357–374. The Duke of Portland addressed a letter to the King on the 12th of March, advising him to refuse his assent to the Bill, and, in the event of the resignation of Ministers, offering to form a new Administration.

† *Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. ii. p. 466. 469, 470. The undated

Full explanations of the grounds on which the resignation of Ministers had taken place were given in both Houses; in the Upper House, Lord Melville stated that though Mr. Pitt had once entertained the opinion that the Catholic Bill was indispensable, he had changed that opinion in consequence of the King's conscientious repugnance; and it was on his declaration of this change of opinion that he returned to office in 1804.* A resolution, condemning the acceptance of pledges by Ministers, which should bind them not to offer any advice to the Crown, was moved in both Houses. In the Lords it was supported by 90 against 171, in the Commons by 226 against 258; so that in the latter House the course taken by the King narrowly escaped a distinct censure.† Shortly afterwards, a motion, expressive of deep regret at the late change of Ministry, was made in the House of Commons, and supported by 198 against 244 votes.

The new Administration which the King now formed was constituted as follows: at its head he placed the Duke of Portland, formerly leader of the Whig party, and Prime Minister of the Coalition Government. He was one of the Whig secession, who, with Burke, joined Pitt after the French Revolution, and was Secretary of State for some years in his Administration. He subsequently held office under Addington, and again under Pitt, and retired to make way for Addington in 1804. Though an upright and honourable man, he never, even when in the prime of life, possessed much vigour or ability; he was now in his seventieth year, and much debilitated by disease.‡ The more

letter of Mr. Grenville (Court and Cab., *ib.* p. 197.), in which he alludes to the defection of the friends of the Prince, Lord Sidmouth, Wilberforce, and Bankes, is misplaced by the editor; it must have been written before the dissolution on the 27th of April. The peerage of Sir T. M. Sutton, created Lord Manners, referred to in the letter, was gazetted on April 14. For a character of Lord Sidmouth, and an account of his straightforward conduct at this time, see Lord Holland, *Mem. of Whig Party*, vol. ii. p. 210-214.

* Lord Camden stated at this time 'that he conceived it to be a sort of pledge he had given to Pitt that the (Catholic) Question should not be mooted during the King's life.' (*Lord Malmesbury*, vol. iv. p. 370.)

† The Opposition expected to beat the new Government in this division, and when they were in the lobby they believed themselves to be a majority; see *Mem. of Romilly*, vol. ii. p. 192-195., who gives an account of the debate.

‡ Lord Malmesbury, who was on intimate terms with the Duke of Portland, gives the following account of his state in 1808:—'His complaint (the stone) was returning, and the excruciating pain this

efficient members of the Cabinet were Lord Eldon, who gladly resumed the great seal; and Mr. Perceval, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons; with Lord Hawkesbury, Mr. Canning, and Lord Castlereagh, who held the seals of the Home, Foreign, and War departments. Lord Camden was President of the Council, and Lord Westmoreland Privy Seal, Lord Mulgrave First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Bathurst President of the Board of Trade, and Mr. Dundas—Lord Melville's eldest son—was President of the Board of Control. Lord Melville himself had undergone his impeachment in 1806, and had been acquitted by a majority of the Peers. He had subsequently made himself the organ of the East India Company with respect to the appointment of a Governor-general as successor to Lord Cornwallis, and had, in the House of Lords, attacked the recall of Sir G. Barlow and the appointment of Lord Minto. The new Government offered him office, which he did not venture to accept; they lost no time, however, in restoring him to his seat at the Privy Council, from the list of which he had been reluctantly removed by Mr. Pitt. He remained out of office until his death, which occurred in 1811, when he was seventy years old. His son, who now succeeded to his former post at the Board of Control, and who subsequently became First Lord of the Admiralty, was a man of respectable abilities, but inferior to his father.

An attempt was made to incorporate Lord Wellesley in the Cabinet. He hesitated for a time, and then declined; but, notwithstanding his obligations to Lord Grenville, he declared himself a supporter of the new Ministry, and received the Garter as the price and pledge of his adhesion.

Lord Moira made to his late colleagues a formal announcement of his separation from them, and of his attachment to the Prince. 'Where he does not go with you (he said) I do not.'

'occasioned, joined to the worry and torment of his official situation, quite broke him down. I have been often with him when I thought he would have died in his chair, and his powers of attention were so weakened that he could neither read a paper, nor listen for a while, without becoming drowsy and falling asleep. But he never would let me go away after dinner, when the rest of the company went, but always urged me to remain on with him, which I often did for hours, when he was equal neither to talk nor to hear. About twelve or one o'clock he generally rallied, and he has made me sit up many nights after my usual hour of retiring, particularly two, the 18th and 19th of January, 1808, when he wished me to assist him in drawing up the King's speech for the opening of Parliament on the 21st.' (*Diaries*, vol. iv. p. 405.)

At the same time he expressed his desire of acting with them, both on public and private grounds, and he stated that he had no political connexion with the new Ministers. The Prince's pecuniary extravagance kept him in a state in which it was inconvenient to him to be on bad terms with the King and his Ministers, and therefore made it necessary for him to ride perpetually at single anchor.

This Ministry was weak in the House of Lords*: its strength lay in the other House, where it was represented by Perceval, Canning, and Castlereagh. Mr. Perceval was the second son of Lord Egmont, and was born in 1762. He became King's counsel and leader of the Midland Circuit in 1796, and in the same year obtained a seat in Parliament. Though he never had much success at the bar, he was, at the formation of the Addington Ministry, in 1801, appointed Solicitor-General, and in the following year became Attorney-General, which office he retained until Mr. Pitt's death. The abilities which he had shown as a debater, while he held those high legal situations, together with his strong anti-Catholic opinions, determined his choice as leader of the House at this conjuncture, in preference either to Mr. Canning or to Lord Castlereagh. 'Though no great lawyer (says Lord Holland), he was, without much genius, a spirited, ready, and forcible speaker; affectionate, frank, and generous in private; dangerous and formidable in public; he united to the most vulgar prejudices and virulent enmities in religion and politics, courage, integrity, and abilities that fortunately very rarely accompany them.'† 'He was (says Lord Brougham) a person of acute and quick, rather than of great, faculties. As Attorney-General to Mr. Addington, and bearing almost the whole burthen of the unequal debate, while the forces of Fox, Pitt, and Windham combined to assail the meagre Treasury bench, his talents sparkled with peculiar brightness. His dexterity in any great or any personal conflict; his excellent language, always purely but unaffectedly English, nor ever chargeable with incorrect taste; his attention constantly awake; and his spirit

* In May, 1807, Lord Malmesbury says: — 'In the course of the last three weeks it has, from various little facts, struck me that the Duke of Portland's colleagues are swerving from him; that they take a great deal on themselves immediately belonging to him, and treat him more as a nominal than as a real head of the Ministry.' (*Court and Cab.*, vol. iv. p. 386.)

† *Mem. of Whig Party*, vol. ii. p. 214.

‘ever dauntless, nay, rather rising with emergency, gained him ‘very great reputation as a ready and a powerful debater.’*’

Mr. Canning was Mr. Perceval’s junior by eight years; he had, under Mr. Pitt, filled the offices of Under-Secretary of State and Treasurer of the Navy; and it had been Mr. Pitt’s intention, if his life had been prolonged into the session of 1806, to give him a Cabinet office.† This intention was intercepted by his death; and Mr. Canning passed into Opposition upon the formation of Lord Grenville’s Administration. A short time before its fall, however, overtures were made to him to join it, probably with a seat in the Cabinet; the negotiation with him was pending when the difference with the King arose, and the Government was overthrown.‡ The position of Mr. Canning, at the formation of the Portland Administration, is thus described by his intimate friend and Mentor, Lord Malmesbury. It will be observed that Mr. Canning was at this time the brother-in-law of the Duke of Portland’s eldest son. Lord Titchfield and he had married sisters, the two daughters of General Scott:—

‘Canning spoke as if the choice of Cabinet places was to be at his refusal, and declared, with a threat, that he never would sit in the same Cabinet with Addington. Canning possesses the peculiar talent of justifying ably and forcibly all he does, or wishes to be done, and that so rapidly and so eloquently, that it is very difficult not to be carried away by what he says. He is unquestionably very clever, very essential to Government; but he is hardly yet a Statesman, and his dangerous habit of quizzing (which he cannot restrain) would be most unpopular in any department which required pliancy, tact, or conciliatory behaviour. He is honourable and honest, with a dash of

* *Statesmen of the Time of George III.*, vol. i. p. 324. A highly favourable account of Perceval’s private character is given by Mr. Wilberforce, *Life*, vol. iv. p. 26. A severe, but not unjust, estimate of his public character may be found in this *Journal*, vol. xx. p. 29.

† *Lord Malmesbury*, ib. p. 343.

‡ See the letters in *Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 125–127.; *Lord Malmesbury*, ib. p. 367. Lord Sidmouth alleged the pending negotiation with Mr. Canning as a reason for his resignation on March 11. 1807. (*Life of Lord Sidmouth*, ib. p. 461.) Lord Malmesbury says:—‘In November [1806], and during the elections, Lord Grenville made several attempts to disunite Pitt’s friends; he offered splendidly to Canning, and to any three or four friends he would name. Lord Wellesley was the intermediary, and negotiated ably; but Canning remained steady, and from principle.’ (*Diary*, ib. p. 354.) There is no trace of this offer in the *Grenville Correspondence*, or in Lord Holland’s *Memoirs*. It can scarcely have gone the length which Lord Malmesbury describes.

the Irishman, and all his plans and ideas of governing would partake of this, and might be as dangerous in practice as he makes them appear plausible by the eloquent way in which he expresses them. He is right, however, quite right, about Lord Sidmouth. Canning may be safely trusted, for, I repeat it, he is honourable and honest, and if Pitt had not forced him in his hot-house of partiality and *engouement* (for it amounted to that), but had left him to ripen gradually, and allowed him, in the early part of his political life, which began only eleven years ago, to experience some hardships, or even contradictions, his mind would have taken a better bend; but spoiled as he has been — feared and wanted as he finds himself — no place is now high enough for him; his ambition rises beyond this visible diurnal sphere, and I fear he may lose many real and cordial friends for uncertain political connexions.' (Ib. p. 367.)

Lord Castlereagh was a year older than Mr. Canning.* He was the eldest son of Robert Stewart, Earl of Londonderry, by his first wife, Lady Frances Seymour, daughter of the first Earl of Hertford.† His early career had been in the Irish Parliament, which he entered in 1790; he was appointed Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant in 1797, and rendered essential service to the Government of Mr. Pitt and to his country, by the part which he took in promoting the union with England. As representative for the county of Down, he became a member of the Imperial Parliament in 1801; and in July, 1802, was appointed President of the Board of Control in Addington's Administration. This office he retained when Mr. Pitt returned to the helm in 1804, and in the following year he was promoted to the Department of War and Colonies. He continued to discharge the duties of this office, retaining also provisionally the Board of Control, until Mr. Pitt's death, when he resigned with his other colleagues, and entered the ranks of Opposition.

Although Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh shared Mr. Pitt's opinions on the Catholic Question, and the latter had taken a peculiarly active part in urging Mr. Pitt to propose his measure of 1801, in spite of the King's reluctance, yet the new Ministers lost no time in dissolving Parliament (which had only been elected in the previous autumn) for the purpose of raising the cry of 'No Popery' and 'the Church in Danger,' and of profiting by this cry in order to increase their strength. Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning adhered indeed to their opinions, and under the Regency, rendered important assistance to the cause

* It is a singular chronological coincidence, that Mr. Fox was born in 1749, Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville in 1759, and Napoleon, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Castlereagh in 1769.

† The Earl of Hertford was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when this marriage took place.

of Catholic emancipation. At this time, however, the latter so far identified himself with the anti-Catholic clamour, that he is a prominent subject of attack, together with Mr. Perceval, in the inimitable letters of Peter Plymley, which appeared soon after the change of Government, and were intended to counteract the intolerant cry raised at this dissolution.

The new Parliament met on the 26th of June, and sat till the middle of August. A resolution was moved in both Houses censuring the dissolution of Parliament, and the ground alleged for the appeal to the country. In the Lords it was supported by 67 to 160; in the Commons by only 155 to 350, showing a majority of 195 for Ministers. It was, therefore, apparent that the country had responded to the appeal in the King's favour upon the Catholic Question, and that the new Parliament was much more favourable to the Ministry than the old one. On this occasion Lord Sidmouth supported the Government, and separated himself from his late associates.

The battle of Jena had been fought in October, 1806, a short time after Mr. Fox's death. In the ensuing winter Napoleon, having accomplished the ruin of the Prussian monarchy, advanced into Poland, and gained against the Russian army the sanguinary and dubious victory of Eylau (Feb. 8. 1807). The siege and capitulation of Danzig followed soon afterwards, and in June the battle of Friedland compelled the Russian Government to negotiate. The Treaty of Tilsit, arranged personally between the Emperors Alexander and Napoleon, was the result (July 7.).

It seems that information soon reached the English Cabinet that a secret article had been agreed to at Tilsit, under which the neutral territory of Denmark would be occupied by Napoleon, and the Danish fleet seized for the use of France. Mr. Canning, impelled by the apparent designs of the French Emperor, and by the information of this supposed fact, and desirous of signalling his advent to office by an act of vigour, determined on demanding the delivery of the Danish fleet into the custody of England, in order to prevent its falling into the power of France. Upon the refusal of Denmark, Copenhagen was bombarded, and the Danish fleet carried away. This extreme exercise of the rights of war took place after the prorogation (10 September); and did not come under the review of Parliament until the following session, which opened on the 21st of January, 1808. Several motions censuring the measure, and denying its necessity, policy, and justice, were then made in both Houses, and supported by Lord Grenville, Lord Sidmouth, Mr. Ponsonby, Mr. Windham, and other speakers. In every

Warwick Public Library

Acq. No. 7526

Date 23.7.75

division, however, the Government obtained a large majority of votes.

During the recess an event had occurred which materially changed the position of the Whig party in the House of Commons. Since the death of Mr. Fox Lord Howick had been their leader in that House; but the death of his father (Earl Grey) in November, 1807, removed him to the House of Lords, and it became necessary to provide a successor. Windham, Sheridan, Tierney, Mr. Grenville, Lord Henry Petty, and Whitbread were, for reasons which were then deemed conclusive, rejected; and the choice, after mature deliberation, fell upon Mr. George Ponsonby, who, in 1806, had filled the office of Irish Chancellor. He was, accordingly, brought into Parliament at the beginning of the session, in order to lead a party to nearly all of whom he was personally unknown.* Mr. Ponsonby was related by marriage to Lord Grey †; and it was this relationship which, to a great extent, had determined the choice: for, as Lord Grey, in passing from the Lower to the Upper House of Parliament, ceased to act as leader, in consequence of the position held there by Lord Grenville, it was thought desirable to consult his feelings and personal claims as much as possible in the selection of a leader for the House of Commons. Mr. Ponsonby continued to act in this capacity until his death in 1817.

The Berlin decree, by which Napoleon's Continental system had been established, was issued in November, 1806, and had been followed by the retaliatory Orders in Council of the British Government in November, 1807. The wisdom of this policy, with which Mr. Perceval completely identified himself, was questioned by able speakers on the Opposition side, in the session of 1808; the other business requires no particular remark, and the prorogation took place on the 4th of July.

Thus far the Portland Administration had weathered the storms

* See Lord Holland, *ib.* vol. ii. p. 236-240.; and the letters in *Court and Cab.*, *ib.* p. 191. 209. 215. 223, 224. In a letter of Nov. 23. 1807 Lord Grenville gives his reasons for declining to write to Lord Grey to recommend a leader in his place. His first reason is: 'That a leader of an Opposition cannot be chosen and appointed as a leader of a Government party may, and that all the elections in the world would not have made Windham or Sheridan leaders of the Old Opposition while Fox was alive. In Opposition, people will follow the hounds (according to Lord Bolingbroke's simile) the man will show them game.'

† Earl Grey married the sister of the first Lord Ponsonby, who was the niece of Mr. George Ponsonby.

of Parliamentary attack and public criticism without material difficulty. Events, however, soon began to thicken, which put its capacity of resistance to a severe test.

The power of Napoleon may be said to have reached its culminating point at Tilsit. The efforts which he subsequently made for extending and consolidating his dominion, though attended with partial and temporary success, were in fact the means by which he undermined his own empire, and prepared the way for his downfall. Foremost amongst these attempts of his restless and unscrupulous ambition were his designs upon Spain and Portugal, which began to manifest themselves in the autumn of 1807. A French army under Junot occupied Lisbon in November, and the royal family of Portugal took refuge in Brazil. In March, 1808, Murat at the head of a French army entered Madrid; and in the same month the abdication of Charles IV., and the proclamation of Ferdinand VII. as King, took place. In May Ferdinand abdicated, and Murat was declared viceroy; in June Joseph Bonaparte was proclaimed King: so quick was the succession of events by which the entire Iberian peninsula was conquered by Napoleon, both its royal families deposed, and a French titular King, of the Bonaparte family, set upon the throne of Spain. These rapid successes produced, however, an equally rapid reaction. The population of Spain and Portugal rose against the French dominion. Juntas, as the local centres of the national insurrection, were formed all over the country; the French fleet at Cadiz was seized by the Spaniards, and a co-operation with the English fleet was established. Deputies were sent to England to solicit succour, and to arouse the popular sentiment in favour of the Spanish cause. The battle of Baylen and the surrender of Dupont occurred in July, 1808, which was immediately followed by the flight of Joseph from Madrid to Burgos.

The news of the Spanish insurrection lighted up a flame of sympathy in England*, and the popular feeling was warmly seconded by Mr. Canning, the Foreign Secretary, and his colleagues. The Government lost no time in sending out supplies of arms, stores, and money to the insurgent juntas, which were assisted by voluntary contributions; and in July, 1808, an expeditionary force, under Sir Arthur Wellesley, sailed from Cork, and landed on the coast of Portugal. The battles of Roliça and Vimiero, fought on the 17th and 21st of August, placed Junot in a position in which he was glad to negotiate;

* There is a strong expression of this sympathy in Mr. Horner's letters of 13th June and 8th July, 1808. (*Life*, p. 424. 427.)

and the result was the Convention of Cintra, by which the French army agreed to evacuate Portugal, and were to be transported to France, with their artillery and property, in British ships.

The Convention of Cintra was received with a burst of indignation both in England and the Peninsula; and the English Government accordingly found themselves compelled to appoint in November a board of inquiry, composed of general officers, with instructions to report upon its conditions, and upon the conduct of the officers by whom it was concluded. The board reported their opinion that no further military proceeding was necessary in the matter; but the King's disapprobation of the articles affecting Spanish and Portuguese interests was afterwards officially signified to Sir Hew Dalrymple, the officer first in command.

After the evacuation of Portugal by the French forces, the English army remained at Lisbon under the command of Sir John Moore. An advance into Spain was now decided upon, for the purpose of co-operating with the Spanish insurgent forces; and the English general penetrated as far as Salamanca and Sahagun; but Napoleon, warned by the disaster at Baylen and the loss of Portugal, invaded Spain in person with an army of 300,000 men, and entered Madrid in December, when he replaced Joseph on the throne. His operations scattered the Spanish levies, and compelled the English army to retreat; he himself returned to Paris, and left to Soult and Ney the pursuit of Sir John Moore, who found a warrior's death at the battle of Corunna, on the 16th of January, 1809. The remains of the English army were here re-embarked and from thence returned to England.

Parliament met for the session of 1809 on the 13th of January. The policy of the English expedition into Spain was severely condemned by Lord Grenville in the House of Lords; a motion of censure upon Ministers on account of the Convention of Cintra was soon afterwards made in the House of Commons by Lord H. Petty, and supported by 153 to 203 votes; it was shortly followed by a motion of Mr. Ponsonby for inquiry into the affairs of Spain, which was supported by 127 to 220 votes. The unpopularity of the Convention of Cintra was visited, as is usual, upon the Executive Government, and involved them in its consequences. Lord Castlereagh, as War Secretary, was in particular the object of this storm. Mr. Canning dissented from some decision confirmatory of the Convention, to which the Cabinet had agreed upon the advice of

the War minister*; and this difference was not confined to him; for the existence of discord between different members of the Cabinet was a matter of general belief.† Lord Grenville, in his private letters, attributes the continuance of the Government in its existing state of weakness entirely to the support and influence of the King. Speaking of the Ministers he says, 'If they change hands at all, it can only be because they are quarrelling among themselves; for I am persuaded, so long as the King chooses to continue them, these very men will command the majorities of both Houses with as much certainty as ever.' Again he says, deprecating any attempt of the Opposition to dislodge Ministers: 'I am satisfied these people, or any people, may command under the King's influence a majority in Parliament; and it would have the appearance of a struggle for

* Lord Malmesbury says: 'The Convention of Cintra excited great dissatisfaction, and I think very justly. Canning protested against an opinion of Cabinet given when he was absent, and which went to confirm it. This was the beginning of all the subsequent disputes between him and his colleagues, and led to the more serious one between him and Lord Castlereagh.' (*Diaries*, vol. iv. p. 411.) In a letter to the Duke of Portland, dated March 24. 1809, Mr. Canning speaks of his desire to resign his office having first arisen 'out of that decision respecting the Convention of Cintra, which was taken by the Cabinet in my absence, and my reason for dissenting from which I felt it incumbent upon me most humbly to lay before the King.' (*Phipps, Mem. of Ward*, vol. i. p. 243.) What this decision was is not apparent; for the Convention does not appear to have required any ratification by the Government; and the King twice conveyed his disapprobation of parts of it to Sir Hew Dalrymple, through the Secretary of State for War. (See *Ann. Reg.* 1812, p. 282.)

† See the letters of Lord Temple, *Court and Cabinets*, vol. iv. p. 234. (probably written in May, 1808), 274. 277. Mr. Grenville, in a letter of Dec. 5. 1808, says: 'The Ministry, when they speak in confidence, speak of the English war in Spain as over; and each of the Ministers begins to extend the circle of his confidential communications, which are full of complaints of each other, and which announce, beyond all disguise, the bad opinion they entertain of their own permanence. They all agree in falling foul of Lord Castlereagh.' (*Ib.*, p. 283.) By the 'English war in Spain being over,' Mr. Grenville means that all hope and intention of prosecuting further hostilities on the part of England against France, in Spain, was at an end. 'One hears much' (says Lord Grenville in a letter of Nov. 4.) 'of the squabbles among the Ministers, the usual consequence of embarrassments and disgraces, which each labours (in such cases) to throw upon his colleagues.' (*Court and Cab.*, vol. iv. p. 276.)

‘power, at a time when a man must, indeed, be of a most depraved ambition, to wish for the appearance and responsibility of governing the country, with the certainty that a Court intrigue would be incessantly at work, with ample means of depriving him of all power to be of real use.’*

In addition to the difficulties of foreign politics created by the necessity of prosecuting the war with Napoleon, there arose at this moment an unexpected storm, which directly concerned the government of the army, and of which the Ministers had to bear the brunt, though it threatened the Throne more than the Treasury bench. This was the accusation of the Duke of York, the Commander-in-chief, brought forward early in the session by Colonel Wardle, relative to the corrupt sale of military commissions by his former mistress, Mrs. Clarke. The scandal and confusion caused by the disclosures to which this inquiry led were extreme; but the Duke of York was defended by Mr. Perceval, who carried an amendment exculpating him from any guilty participation in Mrs. Clarke’s proceedings. The Duke thereupon resigned his office; his resignation was accepted by the King, and Sir D. Dundas was appointed his successor. The following passages from a letter of Mr. W. Fremantle, dated Feb. 16. 1809, will convey an idea of the impression which these proceedings created at the time: —

‘The scene which is going on in the House of Commons is so disgusting, and at the same time so alarming, that I hardly know how to describe it to you. Every day and every hour adds to the evidence against the Duke of York, and it is quite impossible but that he must sink under it. . . . All power and influence of Perceval in the House is quite gone by; he speaks without authority and without attention paid to him; and Canning has made two or three such rash declarations, that he is little attended to. You may judge the situation of the House, when I tell you we were last night nearly three quarters of an hour debating about the evidence of a drunken footman, by Perceval suggesting modes of ascertaining how to convict him of his drunkenness; Charles Long†, near whom I was sitting, telling me at the time what a lamentable proof it was of the want of some man of sense and judgment to lead the House. There is no Government in the House of Commons. You may be assured the thing does not exist; and whether they can ever recover their tone of power remains to be proved; at present Mr. Croker, Mr. D. Brown, and Mr. Baresford are the leaders. Of course, while this

* Letters of Dec. 15. 1808. (Court and Cab., ib. p. 288, 289.)

† The Right Hon. Charles Long was at this time one of the Joint Paymasters-General.

ferment lasts, and God knows when it is to end, no attention will be paid to any other subject.*

The course which the Prince of Wales took during these proceedings against his brother was characteristic. He began by writing a letter, to be shown in the House of Commons, in which he stated that he considered an attack upon the Duke as an attack upon himself.† Finding, however, that the tide was setting with irresistible strength against his brother, he changed his course; he reprobated the Duke's conduct, who, he said, had brought this business upon himself by not paying Mrs. Clarke the allowance which he had promised her; and announced his intention of observing a strict neutrality. The King, hearing of this decision, sent to him in great agony of mind, to request him to reconsider it, on the ground that neutrality in his position was condemnation‡; and the Queen wrote at the same time to say that the King's life and health, as well as the honour of the family, depended on the result. All that the Prince would do was to send down Colonel M'Mahon, of his own household, to vote for the Duke; but he declined to exercise any influence over the other votes which he could determine.§

The session of Parliament came to a close on the 21st of

* Court and Cab., ib. p. 318.

† Mem. of Romilly, vol. ii. p. 267.

‡ The state of the King's sight at this time was such as to incapacitate him from reading and writing; and although he was provided with a Private Secretary (Sir Herbert Taylor) on this account, he preferred for the actual purpose sending a message through the Queen. (See Court and Cab., ib. p. 291.) The last speech which he delivered personally in Parliament was at the beginning of the session of 1805. It seems that this speech was printed, in order that he might read it better. (Court and Cab., vol. iii. p. 411.) All his subsequent speeches until 1811 were, on account of his blindness, delivered by Commissioners. Lord Eldon speaks of the King's 'want of sight' in a letter of November, 1806. (Twiss, ib. p. 11.)

§ See Lord Temple's curious letter of Feb. 26., giving an account of a long interview with the Prince at Carlton House, and his subsequent undated letter. (Court and Cab., vol. iv. p. 325. 380.) Mr. Fremantle says, in a letter of March 24.: 'Every part of the royal family at Windsor, excepting the King, is overwhelmed with despair at the Duke of York's business. The Queen very ill, and two of the princesses dying. The King is said to bear it very firmly; but I have reason to believe he is indignant at his Ministers for having suffered it to come forward at all. The Duke of York, I am told by those who have seen much of him since, is quite sunk under it.' (Court and Cab., ib. p. 335.)

June, without any Ministerial change. But in the meantime Napoleon had not been inactive. The campaign of the Danube had commenced in the spring; the battle of Eckmühl had been fought in April, and Vienna had capitulated in May. The sanguinary conflicts of Aspern and Essling speedily succeeded, but the Austrians were unable to follow up their advantage, and the campaign was terminated by the finishing victory at Wagram in July. While Napoleon was thus occupied in annihilating the last remnants of Austrian independence, he relaxed his exertions in Spain; and allowed Sir A. Wellesley, who had returned in April to Lisbon, and was in command of the main body of English forces, to advance into Spain as far as Talavera, where he gained a hard-fought victory over the French under Marshal Victor, on the 27th of July. His advance, however, was unsupported, and the approach of other French divisions speedily compelled him to fall back upon the Portuguese frontier.

The English Government had not sufficient confidence in the policy of their Spanish interference to make it their exclusive object; for in July they sent a great expedition to the Scheldt, under the command of Lord Chatham, with a view of destroying the French naval arsenals at Flushing and Antwerp. The expedition, through the inefficiency and feebleness of the commander, utterly failed in accomplishing its purpose, and returned to England early in September, after leaving a detachment in the island of Walcheren, which, on account of its unhealthiness, was evacuated before the end of the year.

The failure of this expedition brought about an important change in the English Cabinet. Mr. Canning had for some time considered Lord Castlereagh unequal to the duties of the War Department; he had in April communicated this opinion to the Duke of Portland, and had tendered the resignation of his office unless a new arrangement should be made with respect to that department. The change which Mr. Canning desired to see effected was the substitution of Lord Wellesley for Lord Castlereagh, as War Minister*; and after some

* The Duke of Portland, in a letter to Lord Eldon of June 7th, 1809, thus describes Mr. Canning's demands:—'The great object, and, indeed, the *sine quâ non* with Canning, is to take from Lord Castlereagh the conduct of the war; and perhaps Canning may go so far as to wish that he may not keep the seals, but have some other Cabinet office. But if Lord Castlereagh gives up the War-department, I think Canning would be satisfied, for the present at least.' (*Twiss*, ib. p. 80.) An abstract of the entire correspondence

further negotiation, a promise to this effect was obtained by him from the Duke of Portland, and sanctioned by the King. Lord Camden, who was connected by marriage with Lord Castlereagh, was directed by the King to communicate to him a proposal for a new arrangement with respect to the War department; but Lord Camden found reasons for delaying the performance of his unpleasant duty; and when, upon the failure of the expedition becoming known, Mr. Canning reminded the Duke of Portland that the time was come for transferring Lord Castlereagh's seals to Lord Wellesley, the Duke informed him that nothing had been done to prepare Lord Castlereagh for the announcement, and that he himself was about to retire from office. It had been for some time apparent that the Duke of Portland could not remain at the head of the Ministry, and Mr. Canning had put forward his claims for that post. He laid a foundation for this arrangement by affirming the principle that the head of the Ministry ought to be in the House of Commons. This, as he considered, reduced the question to a choice between Perceval and himself*; and he asserted his claims to a preference over Perceval. The King and the Cabinet, however, did not concur in this view†; and therefore, on the receipt of the Duke of Portland's answer, Mr. Canning, having failed in procuring the removal of Lord Castlereagh and in becoming the successor of the Duke of Portland, lost no time in resigning his office. No sooner had this step been taken than Lord Camden found it necessary to disclose to Lord

which passed between Mr. Canning and his colleagues on this occasion is given in Phipps's *Mem. of Ward*, *ib.* p. 222-246. See also the letters of Lord Mulgrave, who was a member of the Cabinet, *ib.* p. 206-217.

* See Mr. Canning's letter to Mr. Perceval, of Aug. 31., in Phipps's *Mem. of Ward*, *ib.* p. 229.

† Concerning Mr. Canning's endeavours to succeed the Duke of Portland as Prime Minister, see Lord Eldon's letters. (Twiss, *ib.* p. 88. 90. 93.) In a letter of September 14. Lord Eldon says: 'Mr. Canning thinks proper that his determination not to act under a third person, or to do anything else, but be himself Minister, should remain unshaken; and his resignation is certain.' Soon after the Duke of Portland's paralytic stroke in August, the King informed his Ministers that they must soon look out for a new chief. (*Ib.* p. 78.) A full account of Mr. Canning's movements at this time is also given in Mr. Dardis's letter in *Court and Cab.*, *ib.* p. 390-397. The double ground of Mr. Canning's resignation was also known to Lord Grenville, at the time. (*Ib.* p. 372.) A part of Mr. Canning's plan was that Mr. Perceval should become Chancellor instead of Lord Eldon. (Twiss, *ib.* p. 90.)

Castlereagh all that had passed respecting himself and his department. Lord Castlereagh, without hesitation, resigned the office, from which he considered himself to have been virtually dismissed without his knowledge.* Ten days afterwards he wrote to Mr. Canning to demand satisfaction; which demand was promptly complied with. On the 21st of September they met on Putney Heath, attended by Lord Yarmouth and Mr. C. Ellis, as their respective seconds; two shots were exchanged, and at the second fire Mr. Canning received his adversary's ball in his thigh, and a button was shot off the right breast of Lord Castlereagh's coat. The parties then separated. The ground on which Lord Castlereagh demanded this satisfaction was, that Mr. Canning had concealed from him the promise which he had obtained for his removal, and had continued to act with him in the Cabinet, to the extent of allowing him to send out an important expedition, without communicating to him the step which he had taken. Mr. Canning's defence was, that the concealment had not been owing to him, and that he had repeatedly urged that the matter should be communicated to Lord Castlereagh. Without going into the merits of this dispute, we may be permitted to express our concurrence with the view of Sir S. Romilly, that, according to the strictest code of honour, Lord Castlereagh was not justified in sending a challenge, or Mr. Canning in accepting it; and that the case was not one which was fitted for the arbitrement of the pistol.† Mr. Wilberforce is doubtless right in attributing Lord Castlereagh's conduct on this occasion to his Irish education and habits.‡ At the same time, we are bound to admit that the prevailing opinion of that period, more favourable to duelling than the opinion of the

* The respective versions of this somewhat intricate transaction, given by Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Canning, and Lord Camden, with the letters between Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning, may be read in the *Ann. Reg.* for 1809, p. 504-9. 516-30. A commentary upon it, written by Mr. Canning himself, or by one of his confidential friends, was inserted in the *Quarterly Review* for Nov. 1809, vol. ii. p. 412., and attracted much attention at the time.

Lord Castlereagh addressed an explanation to the King in reference to this transaction, and the King sent him a full answer, dated Oct. 8. 1809, in which His Majesty states that Lord Wellesley's name, as successor to Lord Castlereagh, was submitted to him in June, and that it was then intended that the proposed arrangements should be immediately communicated to Lord Castlereagh. (*Mem. and Cor. of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. i. p. 18.)

† *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 293.

‡ *Life*, vol. iii. p. 426-431. 'Manent (he says) vestigia ruris.'

present day, justified Lord Castlereagh's conduct, and considered the provocation as adequate.

The Portland Administration was now dissolved, having lasted just two years and a half. The Duke himself only survived his resignation a few weeks. Early in August he had been seized by paralysis in returning to Bulstrode from a Council, and had been taken out of his carriage speechless and insensible.* The two principal members of the Cabinet, after Mr. Perceval, had likewise resigned. In this state of things the King authorised Mr. Perceval to communicate with Lords Grenville and Grey, for the purpose of forming an extended and combined Administration.† Lord Grenville, on the receipt of this communication, journeyed from Cornwall to London, and, on his arrival, sent to Mr. Perceval a refusal to join the existing Ministers, alleging, as a reason, that his junction with them would be considered as a dereliction of public principle.‡ A similar answer was sent by Lord Grey from Northumberland. The letters of Lord Grenville, published by the Duke of Buckingham, show clearly that at this time he entertained a strong repugnance to office§; partly on account of its troubles and anxieties, and partly on account of his conviction that he would obtain no fair support from the King. It appears that the arrangement contemplated by Mr. Perceval was, that Lord Grenville should be First Lord of the Treasury, and himself

* Letter of Mr. Fremantle, Aug. 13. 1809. (*Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 348.) He died of an operation for the stone.

† That the King consented with the utmost reluctance to this step, advised by his Cabinet, appears from Lord Eldon's letters in Twiss. (*Ib.* p. 97-8.)

‡ Mr. Perceval to Lord Grenville, Sept. 23. 1809. Lord Grenville to Mr. Perceval, Sept. 25. and 29. (*Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 374-6.)

§ It appears from a letter to his brother, the Marquis of Buckingham, March 7. 1807, that Lord Grenville was under an impression that 'he was not competent to the management of men.' 'I never was so naturally (he adds), and toil and anxiety more and more unfit me for it.' (*Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 133.) In letters to Lord Buckingham, of March 26. and 27., he expresses his joy at his relief from office. (*Ib.* p. 148, 149.) In a letter to Lord Buckingham, of Jan. 27. 1810, written at the time when the Government was defeated by the Opposition in the House of Commons on the Walcheren question, Lord Grenville says:—'You love me, I am sure, too well, to wish to see me embarked in such a project as that of carrying on a Government in these times, with a Court influence actively exerted, as before, to undermine me.' (*Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 426.)

Home Secretary.* Mr. Perceval next addressed himself to Lord Sidmouth, seeking, however, not his accession to the Government, but that of some of his friends. The reason assigned for this course was, that some of the old Pittite connexion entertained objections to Lord Sidmouth, and it was therefore feared that they would be alienated from the Government, and determined in favour of Mr. Canning. To this overture Lord Sidmouth's friends turned a deaf ear.† In consequence of the failure of these applications, the old Government was renewed with as few alterations as possible. Mr. Perceval became First Lord of the Treasury, as well as Chancellor of the Exchequer ‡; Lord Wellesley succeeded Mr. Canning as Foreign Secretary; Lord Hawkesbury assumed the War department; and Mr. Richard Ryder took his place as Home Secretary. In this state, Mr. Perceval's Administration met Parliament for the session of 1810. In substance, it was nothing but the old Government, with the substitution of Lord Wellesley for Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh. With respect to the debating efficiency of the Ministry in the House of Commons, this change must have been most important. The Cabinet consisted of ten members, seven of whom were peers; the three commoners were Perceval himself, Mr. C. Yorke, and Mr. R. Ryder.§

The hopes and prospects of England, in respect to the success of her struggle with Napoleon, may be considered to have been at their lowest point of depression at the end of 1809. On the other hand, Napoleon was at this time absolute master of the entire continent, and ruled it with unresisted sway. Accordingly he ceased to fight, from the want of any worthy opponent; he was present at no battle between Wagram, in July, 1809, and Smolensko, in the advance upon Moscow, in August, 1812, a period of more than three years. Owing to the recent frustration of all our recent military enterprises, and to the apparently invincible ascendancy of France upon the continent, the public opinion of England was sunk in a

* Mr. Grenville, Oct. 5. 1809. (Court and Cab., ib. p. 381.)

† Life of Sidmouth, vol. iii. p. 6-9.

‡ It seems that the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer was offered on this occasion to Mr. Milnes, the member for Pomfret, and declined. (Twiss, ib. p. 105.) It was also offered to, and declined by, Lord Palmerston. (Phipps's Mem. of Ward, vol. i. p. 249. 279.)

§ For a list of this Cabinet, see Ann. Reg. for 1810, p. 425. Mr. Richard Ryder, brother of the late Lord Harrowby, was born in 1766, and died in 1832.

state of inevitable despondency, and the leaders of Opposition gave expression in Parliament to the most gloomy anticipations, and to denunciations of the Ministers, to whose mismanagement these national calamities were attributed. It is a just remark of Sir Archibald Alison, that both Napoleon and the French nation were misled by the debates of this time into a belief that the continuance of the war by England, on the continent, was impossible. These debates were carefully reprinted in the '*Moniteur*,' and form, according to Sir A. Alison, a third part of its contents for the year 1810.* Either, it was thought, the attempt would not be made, because Parliament would refuse the supplies necessary for prosecuting hostilities by land; or, if the attempt were made, the English armies would be destroyed. This is not the only instance in which important events have turned upon a misconception by foreign Governments of the character of our Parliamentary debates, and upon the belief that the desponding and censorious habits of English orators will prevent them from consenting to measures of vigour when the moment for exertion arrives. It may be added, that Napoleon likewise mistook the natural hostility of a Parliamentary Opposition to the Government for attachment to himself.

The meeting of Parliament for the session of 1810 occurred on the 22d of January. In both Houses a resolution of censure upon Ministers for the military operations of the preceding year was moved as an amendment to the address. In the Lords the motion was made by Lord Grenville and supported by Lord Grey; it was opposed by Lord Harrowby and Lord Liverpool: and, on a division, was negatived by 144 to 92. In the Commons the motion was made by Lord Gower, and seconded by Mr. Ward in a speech which ably sums up all the main arguments of the Opposition at this period. It was supported by Mr. Ponsonby, the leader of the Whig party; and opposed by Mr. Perceval and the two ex-Ministers, Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning. On a division the Government numbered 263 to 167.† Shortly afterwards Lord Porchester, in the House of Commons, moved for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the expedition to the Scheldt; the Government resisted it, and sustained a defeat, the numbers

* Hist. of Europe, chap. 59. vol. vii. p. 807-821., vol. viii. p. 268, 269. 370.

† The original address was on this occasion seconded by Mr. Peel, who thus came forward as a supporter of Mr. Perceval's Government at a critical moment.

being 195 in favour of the motion and 186 against it. Lord Castlereagh voted with the majority. The papers relating to this expedition laid before Parliament contained a narrative drawn up by Lord Chatham, and presented by him to the King. † This proceeding was regarded by the Opposition as unconstitutional, and Mr. Whitbread accordingly followed up the first victory over Ministers, by moving for copies of all papers relative to the late expedition submitted by Lord Chatham to the King. This motion likewise was carried against the Government by 178 to 171.* Mr. Whitbread prosecuted the campaign by moving resolutions of censure upon Lord Chatham for submitting a private narrative of the expedition to the King, which, with an amendment proposed by Mr. Canning, were carried by a majority of thirty-three (221 to 188), although the Government only met them by moving the previous question. In consequence of this vote Lord Chatham resigned his office of Master-General of the Ordnance.† Thus far the course of the Opposition had been victorious; but their successes were arrested at the critical point. The inquiry into the Scheldt expedition, which had been carried on by the examination of witnesses at the bar of the House, having now reached its close, Lord Porchester, on the 21st of March, moved detailed resolutions of censure upon Ministers; but these, after a debate, in which the conduct of

* Feb. 23. Upon this division Lord Grenville says, in a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham of Feb. 24.: 'I say nothing to you of our victory last night, as you will hear all the particulars from others. It will, I take it, be worse received at Windsor than any event that has happened this many a day. People are asking this morning whether Perceval will resign upon it. But I think it is clear that he must stay in for his own safety till the inquiry is over. Enough has been already proved to make it necessary for him and his colleagues to retain all the support which Ministerial situation can give; and, even so, I much doubt whether they can shelter themselves from censure. Lord Chatham's situation seems quite desperate. He has got into a scrape, from which I don't see how it is possible for him to extricate himself.' (*Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 426.)

† 'The Government are terribly afraid that I shall get them, and myself, into a scrape. But what can be expected from men who are beaten in the House of Commons three times a week? A great deal might be done now if there existed in England less party, and more public sentiment, and if there was any Government.' (*Lord Wellington to Admiral Berkeley, 7th April, 1810; Gurwood, vol. vi. p. 20.*) This example shows that complaints about weak Governments sometimes occurred in the period before the Reform Bill.

the expedition was defended by Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Canning, and Mr. Perceval, were negatived by 275 to 227 votes. It appears that a different result was anticipated by some at least of the Cabinet, and much desired by Lord Wellesley, who expected that, as he had not been involved in the discredit of the Walcheren expedition, he should be called upon to form the new Administration. His plan of a Cabinet was matured, and he is stated to have been surprised and mortified at the actual result. This result was attributed, not so much to the exertions of the Government in influencing votes, as to the preponderance of their arguments in debate.* Later in the session a resolution of censure upon Ministers, with respect to the military operations in Spain, was moved in the House of Lords by Lord Lansdowne (who had recently succeeded to the title by the death of his elder brother†), and a motion on the state of the nation was made by Lord Grey.‡ The business of the session having been transacted, Parliament was prorogued on the 21st of June.

Lord Wellesley appears to have been dissatisfied with the existing construction of the Cabinet, and to have chafed under the supremacy of Perceval. In order to strengthen it he proposed the incorporation of Lord Sidmouth, Mr. Canning, and Lord Castlereagh. Perceval consented somewhat reluctantly with respect to the two first, and overtures were accordingly made to them; but this arrangement was frustrated by the positive refusal of Lord Sidmouth to sit in the same Cabinet

* See the letters to the Marquis of Buckingham, with the writer's name suppressed, of March 26. and April 2. 1810. (Court and Cab., ib. p. 427. 430.) The editor's motive for concealing the name of this person does not appear. He seems to have been a Mr. Dardis, who is often mentioned in the correspondence: he furnished information to Lord Buckingham, and was in the confidence of Lord Wellesley, from whom his authentic facts were derived. Mr. Dardis says, in his letter of April 2.: 'You will also see that there is one proposed way of determining these difficulties, to which it is strongly hoped that all concerned in this "give and take plate" will accede; viz. the putting Lord Wellesley at the head of the Government, when the hunger for place, competitorship, and pretensions may all, by falling in under his banners, be adjusted and satisfied, and thus a strong, consistent, and united government be formed.' (p. 432.) No doubt can exist as to the quarter in which this view originated.

† John, second Marquis of Lansdowne, died Nov. 15. 1809.

‡ Lord Grenville was prevented by illness from attending Parliament in the latter part of this session. (See Court and Cab., ib. p. 448. 445. 447.)

with Mr. Canning. Upon his refusal an application was made to Lord Castlereagh; but Lord Castlereagh, though considering his personal quarrel with Mr. Canning to have been settled by what had passed, thought nevertheless that it would be detrimental to his own character to serve in the same Cabinet with him, and therefore declined the offer. The Cabinet did not consider the accession of Mr. Canning alone desirable; Lord Wellesley refused to agree to any arrangement which should not include Mr. Canning; and therefore no further negotiation took place.*

The accession of Lord Wellesley to the Foreign department confirmed the policy of prosecuting the war in the Peninsula, which, though hitherto on the whole unsuccessful, met with much support and sympathy in this country, on account of its popular and patriotic character. Sir Arthur Wellesley (created Lord Wellington after the battle of Talavera) had not been inactive during the winter and spring: at this time he contrived and quietly executed the celebrated lines of Torres Vedras, which formed a complete circumvallation round Lisbon. When, therefore, Massena invaded Portugal in September, 1810, he found, to his surprise, his progress arrested by an impenetrable barrier; and after exhausting the country of all its resources, and exposing his army to severe privations, he commenced his retreat in November, and finally crossed the frontier in March, 1811. This may be considered as the first decided reflux in the tide of Napoleon's fortunes, for the French armies never again entered Portugal. Its evacuation by Junot was provisional; but its evacuation by Massena was definitive.†

* See Mr. Dardis's letters. *Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 434. 438. 450.; *Life of Sidmouth*, vol. iii. p. 25-28.; *Phipps's Mem. of Ward*, ib. p. 440.

† The following important remarks on the campaigns of the French in Portugal occur in a letter addressed by the Duke of Wellington to Lord Sidmouth in 1826:—

'It is a very curious circumstance, that the cause of their destruction in Portugal was the same as the real cause of their destruction in Russia. The contempt of all the ordinary rules of war, and of the means and gallantry of their enemy, the want and deprivation of food in their own army, and the consequent undisciplined disorders and sickness of the troops, and the hatred of the inhabitants, produced, in both countries, the destruction of the French armies. There was in Russia, besides the frost to aggravate all their distresses, although in some respects an advantage to them; and, moreover, the Russian armies were more equal in

At the end of October, 1810, the King's mental malady returned in an aggravated form; the immediate predisposing cause being his grief on account of the alarming illness of the Princess Amelia, who died on the 2d of November.* Parliament met, and after some delays caused by uncertainty as to the King's state, a Bill was proposed by Ministers, and agreed to by both Houses, which constituted the Prince of Wales Regent, with certain restrictions of his prerogative; these were to cease at the end of a year, viz., on the 1st of February, 1812. The precedent of 1788 was closely followed in the Parliamentary course pursued on this occasion.

When the King's illness commenced, Perceval sought to strengthen his Government by offers to Lord Sidmouth and Lord Castlereagh to join, but Lord Wellesley insisted on the inclusion of Mr. Canning in any reorganisation of the Cabinet; and, as the same personal incompatibility still existed which previously prevented the accession of all the three persons, this negotiation again fell to the ground.†

The political connexions of the Prince of Wales had hitherto been with the Whig party. With Mr. Fox he had pretty constantly maintained habits of close intimacy. Since the death of Fox, Lord Moira and Sheridan had been his political friends. He had always occupied a political position independent of the King and the Court, if not in antagonism to them; and the King's Ministers had, as such, no title to his esteem. Perceval and Lord Eldon had, in fact, earned his bitterest hostility by espousing the cause of the Princess of Wales; a course by which they expected to ingratiate themselves with the King. The Regency restrictions left the Prince's power of changing and selecting his Ministers unlimited; and, while the measure was still pending, he took the resolution of consulting Lords Grenville and Grey upon the answer to be made to the address of the two Houses; and, moreover, of authorising the formation of a new Administration, in which Lord Grenville

numbers to the French in Russia, both during the attack and the retreat, than I ever was to the French in Portugal.' (*Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. iii. p. 25.)

* See the accounts in *Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 458-483. (Lord Grenville's letter in p. 475. is misdated Nov. 30. for Oct. 30.) Full particulars as to the King's state at this time will be found in the evidence of the physicians before the Committees of both Houses (in *Hansard's Debates*). The physicians expected his recovery, notwithstanding his age, which was seventy-two. George III. was born on the 4th of June, 1738.

† *Court and Cab.*, ib. p. 478.

was to be First Lord of the Treasury.* Differences, however, immediately arose as to the preparation of the answer; Lord Moira and Sheridan were also consulted, and an answer prepared by the latter was preferred to that proposed by Lord Grenville and Lord Grey.† The Prince was likewise impressed, through reports of the physicians, with the probability of the King's speedy recovery, and consequent resumption of the royal functions. Under these circumstances the Prince, on the 4th of February, 1811, the day before the Regency Bill received the sanction of the great seal, addressed a letter to Mr. Perceval, stating that it was not his intention to remove the existing Ministers from office. He added, that this step was dictated exclusively by his filial duty and affection.‡ The Prince is related to have been informed by one of the physicians, that, when the King came to learn the change of Ministers, his malady would undergo so great an exacerbation as to put an end to his life, and that the Prince would thus virtually become guilty of parricide.§ In the course of the year, however, the

* See Mr. Horner's letter of Jan. 18. 1811 (*Life*, vol. ii. p. 74.), and Lord Grenville's to Mr. Horner, of 22. Jan., informing him that there is a question of a new Administration, in which he (Lord Grenville) is to be First Lord of the Treasury, and Mr. Tierney Chancellor of the Exchequer, and offering him the office of Secretary to the Treasury. The offer to Mr. Horner was declined. (*Ib.* p. 77.) Sir S. Romilly confirms this account as to Lord Grenville, and adds that Lord Grey, Mr. G. Ponsonby, and Mr. Whitbread were to be the three Secretaries of State, Lord Holland First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Erskine Speaker of the House of Lords, with the Great Seal in Commission. (*Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 359.) Mr. Wilberforce adds a report that Lord Lansdowne was to be Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. (*Ib.* vol. iii. p. 492-4.) Another report was that Lord Moira was to be Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and Sheridan Irish Secretary. (*Moore's Life of Sheridan*, vol. ii. p. 409.)

† Moore, *ib.* p. 379-407.

‡ The Prince's letter, and Mr. Perceval's answer, are printed in the *Ann. Reg.*, 1811. *State Papers*, p. 279. There seems to be a mistake in the dates, for the Prince's letter is dated Feb. 4., and Mr. Perceval's letter, which speaks of the Prince's letter 'of last night,' is dated Feb. 11. The Prince's letter is stated to have been composed by Sheridan. (*Moore*, vol. ii. p. 408. Compare Phipps's *Mem. of Ward*, *ib.* p. 376-384.)

§ *Mem. of Sir S. Romilly*, *ib.* p. 361. It seems that Ministerial changes had even been arranged on the supposition of the King's restoration to health, and of his resumption of his functions in May. (*Duke of Buckingham's Memoirs of Court of England during the Regency*, vol. i. p. 51. 57.) In a letter to Dr. Swire of April 24.

King's malady assumed a permanent form, and his physicians, when examined by both Houses of Parliament in January, 1812, declared that there was no hope of amendment.

The Parliamentary session of 1811 — the first session of the Regency — was not eventful. The restoration of the Duke of York to the office of Commander-in-chief created a debate; and the depreciation of the Bank of England note, under the system of inconvertibility, began to attract attention; but the session closed on the 24th of July without any great party struggle.*

The campaign in the Peninsula for this year was not much more fertile in events. Portugal had now been finally liberated from the French armies by the battle of Fuentes de Onoro; but the capture of Tarragona by the French, Lord Beresford's battle of Albuera, General Graham's battle of Barosa, and the unsuccessful attempts of Lord Wellington on Badajos and Ciudad Rodrigo left matters in Spain nearly in a state of equilibrium.

The month of February, 1812, was the period at which the restrictions on the Regent were to expire; and, although they did not limit his choice of Ministers, they included the officers of the household, and other branches of the prerogative, so that their cessation created an epoch in his authority. The first effect of this cessation came by anticipation, in the shape of Lord Wellesley's resignation, who, in January, announced to the Prince that he could no longer continue to serve under Mr. Perceval, and must withdraw from the Government as soon as the restrictions had expired. Lord Wellesley had, during the last year, been in frequent controversy with Perceval, and in almost open mutiny against his ascendancy; in particular, he had urged the policy of making concessions to the Catholics, in which, though resolutely resisted by Perceval, he had hitherto apparently carried the Prince with him. He likewise complained that Perceval did not prosecute the military operations in the Peninsula with sufficient vigour. Upon Lord Wellesley's resignation the Foreign seals were offered by Per-

1812, reviewing the previous eighteen months, Lord Eldon says of the Prince Regent: — 'My own real opinion is, that, whatever motives his friends or foes may, in their conjectures, ascribe his late conduct to, he has been principally governed by a feeling that, if his father should recover, he would never forgive himself if he suffered him to awake to a scene in which the father should see the servants discarded by his son.' (*Twiss*, *ib.* p. 197.)

* It seems that a negotiation took place near the end of this session for a junction of Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning with Lord Grenville and the Whig party. (*Mem. of Reg.*, *ib.* p. 103.)

oeval to Lord Castlereagh, who peremptorily declined them, on the ground that the offer was merely temporary and provisional. Perceval likewise proposed overtures to Lord Sidmouth; but the Prince, who had at this time a personal repugnance to Lord Sidmouth, positively refused his consent.*

Such was the position of the Ministry when the restrictions expired. The King's state was at this time considered hopeless, and the Regent felt that, for all practical purposes, his reign had begun. Being now his own master he took the step, which he was expected to take, of making an offer to the leaders of the Whig opposition. How far he was sincere in this offer it is not easy to determine; on the one hand he was influenced by his old political connexions, and by the expectations of the Whig party; on the other by the wishes of Manchester House; and by the resentment of Lord Yarmouth for his recall in 1807.† The course which he adopted was, however, so tortuous, that he could hardly have entertained any strong desire of its success. He communicated to the Cabinet his wish that a proposition should be made to Lords Grenville and Grey; whereupon Mr. Perceval prepared the draft of a letter for his consideration, which was submitted to him on the 12th of February. This draft was unsatisfactory to the Prince, on the ground that it was likely to cause the failure of the negotiation; and on the following day he produced the letter which was actually sent. It was shown to Mr. Perceval and to Lord Wellesley, the former of whom highly approved of it, while the latter warmly remonstrated against it.‡ The letter, dated Feb. 13., is addressed to the Duke of York: it begins by a review of the events of the preceding year; the Prince attributes his continuance of the existing Ministers to a sense of duty to the King. He dwells with satisfaction upon the military events of the year of Regency, and announces his wish to persevere in the Peninsular war. After these preliminary observations, he arrives at the material portion of the letter. Having declared that 'he has no predilections to in-

* Letter of Mr. Dardis, Feb. 1. 1812, in *Mem. of Reg.*, ib. p. 215. Lord Temple, ib. p. 247. *Pearse's Life of Lord Wellesley*, vol. iii. p. 208. Lord Wellesley and his friends fully expected that the Prince would make him Prime Minister when the restrictions ceased. (*Mem. of Reg.*, ib. p. 170.) Concerning Lord Wellesley's exaggerated opinion of his own importance at this period, see Phipps's *Mem. of Ward*, ib. p. 424.

† See Lord Grenville's letter, 6 Jan. 1812. (*Mem. of Reg.*, ib. p. 178.)

‡ *Mem. of Reg.*, ib. p. 257.

‘dulge, no resentments to gratify, no objects to attain but such as are common to the whole empire,’ he expresses a wish that ‘some of those persons with whom the early habits of his public life were formed would strengthen his hands, and form a part of his Government.’ ‘With such support (he adds), and aided by a vigorous and united Administration, formed on the most liberal basis, I shall look with additional confidence to a prosperous issue of the most arduous contest in which Great Britain was ever engaged.’ He lastly authorises the Duke of York to communicate the letter to Lord Grey, who is to show it to Lord Grenville.*

The offer thus conveyed to Lords Grey and Grenville, through the Duke of York, was rightly considered by them not as an authority to form a new Administration, but as a proposal to them to join the existing Government with certain modifications. They, moreover, believed that the direction to communicate first with Lord Grey was intended to sow jealousy between the two lords, because Lord Grenville had since 1806 acted as leader of the Whig party in the House of Lords. The attempt, however, failed: they agreed without hesitation to decline the offer; and on Feb. 15. addressed a letter to the Duke of York, in which they informed him of their decision. ‘All personal exclusion (they said) we entirely disclaim. We rest on public measures; and it is on this ground alone that we express without reserve the impossibility of our uniting with the present Government. Our differences of opinion are too many and too important to admit of such an union.’ They proceed to advert to the state of Ireland, and to express a firm persuasion of the necessity of a ‘total change of the present system of government in that country,’ and of the immediate repeal of the civil disabilities of the Catholics. The two lords waited on the Duke of York with their answer, who received

* This letter was versified by Moore in his celebrated parody—‘At length, dearest Freddy, the moment draws nigh,’ &c., which is one of the wittiest and most pungent pieces of political satire in our language. The passage in which the Prince declares that he has no predilections was naturally that most resented by the Whig party, and is thus happily rendered by Moore:—

‘I am proud to declare I have no predilections,
My heart is a sieve where some scattered affections
Are just danced about for a moment or two,
And the finer they are, the more sure to go through.’

The sensation which the appearance of this parody produced is described in a letter from Moore to his mother. (*Memoirs of Moore*, vol. i. p. 267.)

them with cordiality, and expressed great solicitude for the success of the negotiation. As soon as he had read the letter he insisted strongly that the Prince's intention had been misunderstood; that he did not wish to confine them to junction with the existing Government, but invited them to rally round him. The Duke of York then urged Lords Grey and Grenville, upon this assurance from him, to take back their answer and reconsider it. This proposal they respectfully declined, though they entertained no doubt of the Duke's sincerity; stating as their reason that the language of the Prince's letter admitted of only one interpretation, and that they saw no prospect of removing their grounds of difference with Mr. Perceval and his colleagues.*

The Prince treated this answer as final, and immediately informed Perceval that he would be continued as Minister.† On learning this result, Lord Wellesley hastened to Carlton House, in order to surrender his seals; and was with some difficulty induced to retain them for a few days. On the following day, Lord Wellesley sent through Lord Eldon a message to Perceval that his recent conduct towards himself had been unmannerly, disrespectful, and contrary to the tenour of his professions; but that, when out of office, he would cease to feel any resentment towards him, from gratitude at being relieved from the degrading situation of serving under him. At his audience of leave Lord Wellesley earnestly implored the Prince not to form a Government upon the principle of maintaining the Catholic disabilities, which would be the case if he continued Perceval; and he denounced in strong terms the blindness and selfishness of the statesmen who clung to this policy. The seals of the Foreign Office were now delivered to Lord Castlereagh, who held them for the ten years until his death in 1822.‡ Lord Camden resigned the Presidency of the

* Letters of Lord Temple and Mr. Grenville. (Mem. of Reg., ib. p. 235. 237.)

† Twiss's Life of Eldon, vol. ii. p. 189.; Lord Grenville to the Marquis of Buckingham, Feb. 17. ib. p. 238. Mr. Grenville mentions that the Duke of York sent a verbal message from the Prince Regent to Lord Grey, to say that he trusted that what had passed would make no interruption in their private friendship; afterwards he adds:— 'Canning's language is reported to be as violent as ever against Perceval, and to regret nothing in our conduct except that we did not sufficiently temporise with the Prince to have succeeded in turning out Perceval, which, Canning says, we might easily have done.' (Ib. p. 209.)

‡ Mem. of Reg., ib. p. 257-262. 268.

Council, and was succeeded by Lord Sidmouth; but he remained a member of the Cabinet without office. Lord Sidmouth, it seems, expressed at the time his satisfaction at this junction, on the ground that he would be associated with those who had acted under him as Prime Minister, and that he should not be exposed to the treatment which he had experienced from Mr. Pitt in 1805.*

On reviewing this transaction, we perceive that the Prince's proposal came in an indirect, ungracious, and suspicious form, and was calculated to deter the two leaders from acceptance, and even from negotiation. Neither of the latter was disposed to make a concession in order to remove difficulties. Lord Grenville, in particular, was strongly disinclined to office, and entertained a rooted distrust of the Prince's sincerity.† Lord Grey entirely concurred with him as to their joint answer. There can be no doubt that the words of the letter were inconsistent with the Duke of York's interpretation; that the Prince meant only to offer a junction is indeed obvious from the fact that he originally instructed Perceval to prepare his letter.‡ Whether if the two leaders had asked for an audience, and had come into personal communication with the Prince, a different result would have been obtained, is uncertain. It is clear that the Duke of York believed the Prince to have intended something more than to make an offer in order that it might be refused. The same was likewise Lord Wellesley's conviction. His animosity against Perceval was now at its height; and he seems to have thought that the Prince would have consented to the formation of a Ministry founded upon a junction between Lords Grenville and Grey on the one hand, and himself and Mr. Canning on the other. Perceval's only support came from Manchester House; and the Prince had until lately entertained a strong repugnance for Lord Eldon.§ Even after the breach

* Life of Sidmouth, vol. iii. p. 73.

† 'I have been betrayed once by the King, and I have no taste for affording to his son the same opportunity, when I have so little cause to doubt that he has the same disposition.' (Lord Grenville to the Marquis of Buckingham, 13th Feb. 1811; *Mem. of Reg.*, ib. p. 224.)

‡ Sir S. Romilly considers the offer to have been for a coalition with Perceval, to have been insincere, and to have been properly rejected. (*Memoirs*, vol. iii. p. 10-12.)

§ In a letter of April, 1812, Lord Eldon says of the Prince: — 'I have his own authority for believing that the kingdom produced no man whom he more hated than your friend the writer of this letter' (*Twiss*, ii. p. 197.), which statement he repeats in another subsequent letter. (*Ib.* p. 225.)

of the negotiation with the Whig leaders, Lord Wellesley entertained hopes that he would be preferred to Perceval.* The Prince's anger at the answer made to his letter likewise seems inconsistent with the supposition that he meant nothing real; for if he had simply called forth the answer which he expected and wished to obtain, there was nothing to provoke his resentment.†

Mr. Perceval, however, was not destined to enjoy for long the fruits of the Regent's favour. On the 11th of May, just three months after the correspondence which led to the renewal of his lease of office, he was shot by Bellingham in the lobby of the House of Commons. The suddenness and atrocity of this act created much public sympathy, and stimulated the liberality of the House of Commons, who, in consequence of a message from the Prince Regent recommending a provision for his family, voted 50,000*l.* to his children, an annuity of 2000*l.* to his widow, and an annuity of 1000*l.* to his eldest son. They also voted a monument to his memory in Westminster Abbey.

The Administration of Mr. Perceval was now dissolved, having lasted two years and nine months. The Cabinet deliberated whether, with Lord Liverpool as Prime Minister, they were strong enough to carry on the Government, without making overtures either to Lords Grey and Grenville, or to Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning. They decided this question in the negative‡; and accordingly, by the command of the Prince

* Mem. of Reg., ib. p. 260.

† The Prince 'is furious indeed with indignation against the "early friends."' (Lord Eldon, March 30. 1812; Twiss, vol. ii. p. 193.) 'The language of Carlton House is said to be full of anger.' (Lord Grenville, Feb. 17.; Mem. of Reg., ib. 238.) The language of the Prince against the writers of the letter was so violent at a dinner at Carlton House, that when the Princess Charlotte went away to make her first appearance at the opera, she rose in tears, and spoke strongly to Sheridan as he led her out, upon the distress which she had felt in hearing her father's expressions. It should be added, that when she was at the opera, seeing Lord Grey in the box opposite to her, she got up and kissed her hand to him repeatedly, in the sight of the whole house. (Mr. Grenville, Feb. 24. 1812; Mem. of Reg., ib. p. 250.; Phipps's Mem. of Ward, ib. p. 432.) This incident gave rise to the beautiful stanzas of Lord Byron:—'Weep, daughter of 'a royal line,' &c. Lord Byron, in his Journal, 18th Feb. 1814, describes them as 'the stanzas on Princess Charlotte's weeping at 'Regency's speech to Lauderdale in 1812.' The Princess Charlotte was at this time sixteen years old. She was born Jan. 7. 1796.

‡ Twiss, Life of Eldon, vol. ii. p. 209.

Regent, Lord Liverpool, on May 17., invited the two latter statesmen to join the Administration. This offer was declined by both: by Lord Wellesley, on the ground of the hostility of the Government to the Catholic Question, and their want of vigour in prosecuting the Spanish war; by Mr. Canning on the former ground alone.* The Prince would probably have been satisfied with this attempt at strengthening his Government, and have filled up the vacant offices with persons of second-rate importance, if his path had not been crossed by a motion of Mr. Stuart Wortley, who, on May 21., carried by 174 to 170 votes an Address for the formation of a strong and efficient Administration. The result of this Address was, that Lord Wellesley was authorised to prepare the plan of a Ministry, and to submit it to the Prince. His first step, in pursuance of this authority, was to inquire, through Mr. Canning, whether Lord Liverpool and his colleagues, or any of them, would join a Government formed by Lord Wellesley upon the principles of an early settlement of the Catholic Question, and a vigorous prosecution of the Spanish war. This application produced an immediate refusal on the part of Lord Liverpool and his colleagues. A similar communication was at the same time made orally to Lords Grey and Grenville; but this communication produced nothing but a memorandum, commenting on the two principles laid down by Lord Wellesley, promising a warm support to the removal of Catholic disabilities, and expressing a qualified and conditional opinion on the mode of prosecuting the war in Spain.† At this stage of the business, the Prince put an end to the unlimited commission which he had given to Lord Wellesley, and authorised him to communicate to Lords Grey and Grenville the following proposal: viz. that Lord Wellesley should be First Lord of the Treasury, and be charged with the formation of the Government; that Lord Moira, Lord Erskine, and Mr. Canning should be members of the Cabinet; and that Lords Grey and Grenville should recommend four other names, if the Cabinet should consist of twelve, and five if it should consist of thirteen. This proposal was rejected by Lords Grey and Grenville; on the ground that it was proposed to construct

* See the papers relative to Lord Liverpool's proposal to Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning, in Ann. Reg. 1812, p. 346-360.

† Lords Grey and Grenville gave this memorandum to Lord Wellesley, and accompanied it with an oral statement that 'it did not appear there was any authority from the Prince to communicate with them, and therefore they did not consider themselves as entered into a negotiation for making an Administration.' (*Mem. of Regency*, ib. p. 317.)

the Cabinet on 'a system of counteraction inconsistent with the prosecution of any uniform and beneficial course of policy.' Their answer was sent on the 3rd of June, and Lord Wellesley's hopes of forming a Ministry thus came to an end; although the Prince had, as it appears, given him every assistance for accomplishing his object. Lord Moira now appeared as a principal upon the scene. On the 5th he addressed Lords Grey and Grenville, referring to a previous letter of his own, and requesting an interview with them for the purpose of removing misunderstandings. The two lords, however, in a note of the same day, courteously, but decidedly, refused to enter upon any unauthorised discussions. On the following day Lord Moira came forward with authority to form an Administration, and with special instructions to address himself to Lords Grey and Grenville. An interview thereupon took place, in which explanations were given respecting the Catholic Question, the differences with America, and other questions of urgency, which the two lords deemed satisfactory; Lord Moira likewise stated that he had received his commission without any restriction or limitation. All preliminary difficulty as to fundamentals was therefore removed; a question was, however, put to Lord Moira, whether the great offices of the household would be included in the political changes. Lord Moira declined to give a positive assurance on this point; but Lords Grey and Grenville considered it 'indispensable that the connexion of the great offices of the Court, with the political Administration, should be clearly established in its first arrangements.' Upon this point of difference the negotiation was broken off, and was not afterwards renewed.*

The Prince thought that the attempts which he had thus made sufficed to satisfy the Address of the House of Commons, and he accordingly set about repairing the breaches in his existing Ministry, without the introduction of any leading statesmen into the Cabinet. Lord Liverpool became First Lord of the Treasury, and Mr. Vansittart Chancellor of the Exchequer; Mr. Richard Ryder resigned the Home Office to Lord Sidmouth; and Lord Harrowby became President of the Council. Lord Bathurst passed from the Board of Trade to the department of War and Colonies. The other Ministers remained

papers relating to the negotiations of the Marquis Wellesley and the Earl of Moira, for forming a new Administration, *Ann. Reg.*, *ib.* p. 860-878. Moore attributes Lord Moira's conduct respecting the household to a point of honour; his opinion being adverse to the line which he took. (*Mem. of Moore*, vol. i. p. 287.)

as before; the lead of the House of Commons being now assumed by Lord Castlereagh.

The history of this negotiation shows that the Prince was desirous of bringing about a junction of Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning with the existing Ministers, and that he gave Lord Wellesley sufficient powers for effecting this object, if the personal and political objections could have been overcome. But although he authorised negotiation with the Whig leaders, he did not communicate with them directly, or give them powers for the formation of a Government.* They again were inclined to take advantage of every presentable ground for repudiating the advances made to them, and for justifying a refusal, unless they received a direct and unlimited authority for forming a Ministry.† The offer made by Lord Wellesley, tending to which Lords Moira and Erskine, together with

* In a confidential report of an interview of Lord Wellesley with the Prince Regent, on May 25. 1812, the Prince is represented to have said, that 'as to making a proposition for a junction with Opposition, nothing should ever induce him to employ them. That he had no objection to one or two of them individually; but, as a body, he would rather abdicate the Regency than ever come into contact with them.' The writer adds: 'It is useless to state the outrageous vehemence with which the Prince abused the Opposition.' (Mem. of Reg., ib. p. 322, 323.) This conversation took place in the interval between the attempt of Lord Wellesley and the commission given to Lord Moira. During the first year of the Regency frequent attacks had been made on the Prince at meetings, in the press, and partly in Parliament, all of which emanated from Whig quarters; they could not fail to leave their sting behind. When this negotiation was at an end, Lord Moira was offered and accepted the Garter. What passed afterwards is related by Moore, who was on terms of friendly communication with Lord Moira, in a letter written at the time: 'On the Friday Lord Moira went to the levee, and was installed. The next day the Prince had a great dinner of what he called friends, to which Lord Moira was not invited. And three times that day, both before and after dinner, he declared that if Lord Grenville had been forced upon him he should have abdicated. This was his expression. A friend of ours was there, and asked if this declaration was to be kept a secret; and one of the princes who was present told him not; that the Regent wished to have it known. This is an absolute fact, and shows what a dupe poor Lord Moira was.' (Mem. of Moore, vol. i. p. 296.)

† In a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham, written on June 5., the day before the offer of Lord Moira, Lord Grenville says: 'I grieve to say it, but my opinion now is, that the thing must finally come to us in a shape in which we shall be compelled to look at it.' (Mem. of Reg., ib. p. 351.)

five persons to be named by Lords Grey and Grenville, were to be members of the Cabinet, would have given the Whigs a majority in a Cabinet of thirteen*. The point upon which the final negotiation went off was not of any great importance, and must be considered to have been rather a pretext than a real motive; especially as Lord Yarmouth subsequently stated in Parliament, that he and the other high officers of the household would have resigned if the intended Ministry had been formed. This intention had indeed been imparted to Sheridan, in order that it might be communicated to Lords Grey and Grenville; but he concealed the fact, with the deliberate object of frustrating the negotiation.† We willingly recognise the high sense of honour and inflexible integrity which actuated the Whig leaders on this occasion, which made them resent the very suspicion of accepting place without power; and which induced them to refuse office unless they could obtain it precisely on their own terms.‡ At the same time we cannot but think that the country suffered materially in its best interests by a decision which excluded from the Government, for a long series of years, some of the ablest, wisest, and purest-minded statesmen of the day, which retarded the passing of Catholic emancipation by seventeen years, and which destroyed the only chance of averting the war with America. We may likewise remark that, when it is said that the Whigs were excluded from power during the twenty-three years from 1807 to 1830, it should not be overlooked that offers were made to them by the King in 1809, and by the Prince Regent on two occasions in 1812, the latter of which, at least, might have led to acceptance upon honourable terms.

Of the four leaders with whom these negotiations occurred, Lord Grenville, although he took part in Parliamentary debate

* See Mr. Grenville's letter, *Mem. of Reg.*, ib. p. 344.

† Moore, *Life*, ib. p. 426. His biographer considers this the only indefensible act in his public life.

‡ Mr. Horner, in a letter written at the time, describes the result of this negotiation as 'the triumph of inveterate duplicity, and the low arts of a palace, over an inflexible and proud integrity.' (*Life*, vol. ii. p. 111.) He expressed a similar opinion in another letter p. 113. Sir Samuel Romilly approves of the refusal; he thinks that the Prince was insincere in his negotiation, and that, if Lords Grey and Grenville had entered the Ministry, some pretext for their removal would soon have been found. On the other hand, the article in this *Journal*, for July, 1812, maintains that the reasons assigned by the leaders of the Whigs for rejecting the Prince's offers were inconclusive and insufficient, vol. xx. p. 32-5.

some years longer, never again filled any official position, or received any overture which was known to the public. Lord Grey continued an active member of Opposition until 1830, when he became the chief of the Reform Ministry. Lord Wellesley never again filled any Cabinet situation; but he was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from 1821 to 1828; he held the Court office of Lord Steward in 1830, and was again Lord Lieutenant in 1833-4. Mr. Canning received overtures to join Lord Liverpool's administration immediately upon its formation. The offer made seems to have been that he should hold the Foreign Department, and that Lord Castlereagh should be Chancellor of the Exchequer, and leader of the House of Commons. Mr. Canning rejected this offer, because he would not consent to be led by Lord Castlereagh. It appears that the qualifications of Lord Castlereagh for the lead of the House were generally considered superior to those of his rival*; notwithstanding the undoubted pre-eminence of the latter in eloquence and ability. Mr. Canning remained out of office from 1809 to 1814, when he went on a mission as ambassador to Lisbon. In 1813 he dissolved his political connexion with Lord Wellesley, and formally disbanded his party of followers in the House of Commons.† In 1816 he re-entered the Cabinet as President of the Board of Control, an office which he resigned in January, 1821. In 1822, he had accepted the office of Governor-general of Bengal, when the death of Lord Londonderry opened to him the much-coveted post of Foreign Secretary and leader of the House of Commons. On the

* Stapleton's *Life of Canning*, vol. i. p. 67.; *Wilberforce's Corresp.* vol. ii. p. 232. Mr. Wilberforce remarks in his *Diary*, June 8. 1812: 'How striking is Canning's example! Had he fairly joined Perceval on the Duke of Portland's death, as Perceval offered, he would now have been the acknowledged head, and supported as such. But his ambitious policy threw him out, and he sank infinitely in public estimation, and has since with difficulty kept buoyant.' (*Life*, vol. iv. p. 34.) Mr. Canning's reasons for insisting on the lead of the House of Commons are stated in his letter (*ib.* p. 40.). In October, 1812, after his return for Liverpool, he stated that twice in the previous six months the seals of Secretary of State had been offered to him, and that he had twice declined them. (*Speeches at Liverpool*, p. 87.) This refers to the offer upon Perceval's death in May, and to the subsequent offer in July, after the formation of Lord Liverpool's government.

† See *Mem. of Reg.*, vol. ii. p. 36.; *Life of Sidmouth*, vol. iii. p. 106. It was, we believe, on this occasion that Lord Dudley said of Mr. Canning's party, that they dined 14 and voted 12.

resignation of Lord Liverpool in 1827, Mr. Canning succeeded him as Prime Minister, but died in a few months.

The leaders of the Whig party were at the time of these Ministerial negotiations so deeply pledged against the policy of the Spanish war, that, if they had acceded to power in June, 1812, they might perhaps have arrested the career of Lord Wellington, which, after many checks and reverses, was now assuming a victorious and progressive character. But as the battle of Salamanca was fought in July, 1812; and as Napoleon was already engaged in his fatal expedition to Moscow, it may be doubted whether any such result would have ensued. Certainly, if Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning had been included in the Cabinet, they would have done their best to prevent any relaxation of exertion in that quarter. On the other hand, it is certain that the success of the Peninsular War, and the part which England took, both in the first and second overthrow of Napoleon, threw a lustre over the Cabinet of Lord Liverpool, and over Lord Castlereagh as its Foreign Secretary; while the same events cast a certain discredit upon the Whigs, who had from the beginning condemned the policy of carrying on the war in Spain. As a party they were rendered unpopular on this ground at the return of peace; in the same manner, though not to the same extent, that they had been rendered unpopular twenty years earlier by the opinions of their leaders on the French revolution.

The popularity which the Cabinet of Lord Liverpool had reaped from the results of its foreign policy, from the successes of the British arms upon the Continent, and the triumphant career of the Duke of Wellington, was, after a time, dissipated by the illiberal and unprogressive character of its domestic policy. The financial incapacity of Mr. Vansittart, the coercive severity of Lord Sidmouth, the narrow-minded immobility of Lord Eldon, and the supposed sympathies of Lord Castlereagh with the despotic courts of the Continent, effectually shook the hold of this Ministry upon public favour; such popularity as it retained in 1820 was rudely demolished by the proceedings known as the Queen's Trial. But the transfer of the lead of the House of Commons to Mr. Canning, and the introduction of Mr. Frederick Robinson, Mr. Peel, and Mr. Huskisson into the Cabinet, mitigated the Toryism of the Government, and raised its standard of intelligence and ability. The semi-liberal phase upon which it now entered gave it fresh vitality; and new Cabinets formed substantially upon the same principle succeeded, until the passing of the Catholic Question in 1829 divided the supporters of the Duke of Wel-

lington's government, and, combined with the growing feeling in favour of popular reforms, finally brought about its overthrow. In the meantime, the Whigs, led by Lord Grey in the Lords and by Mr. Brougham in the Commons, had during these administrations been the steady advocates of sound, enlightened, and liberal principles, with respect to retrenchment of expenditure, taxation, currency, education of the poor, colonial slavery, religious toleration, mitigation of punishments, amendment of the law, and parliamentary reform; and, on their accession to office in 1830, they commenced a series of practical measures which have been continued to the present day; which the interposition of Conservative Ministries has not been able to interrupt; and which, on the whole, have been crowned with greater success than even their authors had ventured to anticipate.

ART. II. — 1. *Report of the Trial of Madeleine Smith, before the High Court of Justiciary at Edinburgh, June 30th to July 9th, 1857.* By ALEXANDER FORBES IRVINE, Advocate. Edinburgh: 1858.

2. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Prosecutors.* May, 1856.

DIFFERING as Scotland and England do in many national characteristics, there is nothing in which these differences are more conspicuously shown than in their respective systems of jurisprudence. By merely crossing a stream, or passing a bleak range of hills, an Englishman will find himself in a part of his native island where civil rights and social *status*, where questions of liberty and life, are determined by laws totally different from his own. That which is mere concubinage in England may amount to a legal marriage in Scotland. What is bigamy in the one country, owing to the non-recognition by the English Courts of a Scotch divorce in the case of an English marriage, may be a lawful second marriage in the other. A child who would be a bastard in England may be legitimate in Scotland. Contracts which could not be enforced south of the Tweed are binding north of that river. In England it is impossible to perpetuate an entail by the mere force of a deed of settlement: in Scotland there are entails which cannot be broken except by Act of Parliament. If a crime be committed, it must be detected, and proved, and punished in a different manner. The

verdict of an English jury is unanimous: in Scotland the verdict in criminal cases is decided by a majority. In England, when a man is put upon his trial he is declared to be either Guilty or Not Guilty: in Scotland the charge may be declared to be Not Proven.

These are a few only of the differences in the jurisprudence of the two countries; but they are sufficient to show how great a contrast exists between them, and it would be interesting to compare them in a variety of details. This, however, would require a volume; and in the present article we propose to confine our attention to some salient points of contrast in their respective systems of criminal procedure; and we shall avail ourselves for this purpose of the report of a recent trial, which must be fresh in the recollection of our readers, and in which the difference between the two was conspicuously shown.

Such an inquiry may be not without use. For the object of the forms of criminal procedure in both countries must be the same, namely, the protection of the innocent, and the discovery and punishment of crime. To these great ends all rules and formulas ought to be subordinate. To exclude any suspicion of partiality or unfairness, as little as possible should be left to the discretion of those who administer the law. It is therefore necessary that general rules should be laid down and adhered to, however hard their operation may seem to be in particular cases; and it is also of the last importance that these rules should be such as are likely to provide most effectually for the ends in view. On a comparison between the Scotch and English systems, it might perhaps be difficult to decide which of the two, taken separately, is the best adapted for the defence of innocence and the detection of guilt; but we think it is not at all difficult to show that in each there are deficiencies that might be supplied, and faults that might be corrected, by the example of the other; and that from a judicious amalgamation of the two might be formed a system of procedure superior to either as it now stands.

The case to which, for the sake of illustration, we shall chiefly make reference in the following pages is that of Madeleine Hamilton Smith, who was tried at Edinburgh, in July, 1857, for the alleged murder, by poisoning, of Pierre Emile L'Angelier. This has become one of the *causes célèbres* of Great Britain. The relations between the prisoner and the deceased—her former passionate attachment to him—her age, sex, and social position—her unparalleled letters—the dark and impenetrable mystery in which his death is still shrouded, after an investigation which exhausted every possible means of arriving at the truth—the

remarkable ability displayed both on the side of the prosecution and the side of the defence, — all these circumstances combine to invest the case with an extraordinary degree of interest; and it would be difficult to find in the criminal annals of any country a trial more likely to stimulate, and yet baffle, curiosity.

We will state very shortly the leading facts.

L'Angelier was a native of Jersey, and in the year 1855, while in the employment of a mercantile firm in Glasgow, became acquainted with Madeleine Smith, the eldest daughter of Mr. Smith, an architect, who resided in Blythwood Square, in that city. An attachment sprung up between them; and as the young lady's parents were opposed to an engagement, they corresponded secretly, and had several clandestine interviews. In the month of May, 1856, she surrendered herself entirely to L'Angelier, and her letters to him were of the most compromising character, breathing the warmest language of passionate attachment, and addressing him constantly as her darling husband. But in the course of the following winter a Mr. Minnoch paid his addresses to her; and in January, 1857, he made proposals of marriage, which she accepted; and it was afterwards arranged that the wedding should take place in the month of June following. She kept up, however, a most affectionate correspondence with L'Angelier until the beginning of February, 1857, when, becoming jealous of the attentions of her new admirer, he returned one of her notes. She then wrote and proposed that the engagement between them should be broken off; and became very urgent to have all her letters returned. L'Angelier not only did not comply with her request, but seems to have threatened to show the letters to her father. She wrote, on the 11th of February, in the most agonizing terms of entreaty to him, begging him not to make her 'a public shame;' and then, two or three days afterwards, resumed her correspondence with him in her former strain of passionate love. Her bedroom was on the ground-floor, facing the street; and through the bars of the window she used to pass notes to L'Angelier, and on one occasion undoubtedly she received him into the house at night. On the 21st of February she purchased arsenic at a shop in Glasgow, and on the 6th of March the same poison at another shop; on each occasion signing her name in the druggists' book, and on the last accompanied by a female friend. She said at the time that she wanted the arsenic to kill rats; but when judicially examined afterwards before her trial, she declared that she made use of it as a cosmetic. What really was done with it, there was no evidence to show. As the attentions of Mr. Minnoch became more marked, L'Angelier's suspicions were

again roused, and early in March he wrote to her demanding an explanation. To this she sent an evasive reply, and soon afterwards left Glasgow with her family to go to the Bridge of Allan, near Stirling. From that place she wrote on the 13th to L'Angelier, and on the 16th, three days afterwards, to Mr. Minnoch, two letters, which are, we hope, without a parallel in the annals of amatory correspondence, for in each she pledged herself to the person addressed, and left each under the impression that he was the sole object of her love. She then returned to Glasgow, and on the 18th of March, accompanied by a young lady, she made a third purchase of arsenic at the same shop where she had bought the poison on the 6th previously. On the 19th L'Angelier left Glasgow for the Bridge of Allan, and on the same day a note came to his lodgings from Madeleine Smith, appointing an interview for the following night, Thursday, the 20th, which was forwarded to him at the Bridge of Allan. The next day she wrote to him again, thinking he was still at his lodgings in Glasgow, saying that she had waited for him, but he did not come; and adding, 'I will wait again to-morrow night—same hour and arrangement.' She then earnestly begged him to meet her at the time appointed.* This letter was received by L'Angelier, at the Bridge of Allan, on the morning of Sunday, the 22nd; and on the evening of that day he arrived at his lodgings in Glasgow. He quitted them about nine o'clock, and was not again seen by any one who could give evidence of the fact at the trial, until he returned to his lodgings, about half-past two in the morning, when he rang the bell violently, and said he was very ill. He rapidly became worse, and died in a few hours, his body, on a *post mortem* examination, showing unmistakably that his death was caused by his having taken a large quantity of arsenic.

The question was, by whom was that arsenic administered? The jury, by a majority, found the charge against Madeleine

* In this rapid sketch we of course cannot attempt an analysis of the evidence, but there was much controversy at the trial about the date of this letter, which was a most important fact to ascertain. The post-mark was 'Glasgow, March 21. 1857,' and the prosecution assumed that the 'to-morrow night,' alluded to in it, was Sunday the 22nd. But we think that the balance of probability is greatly in favour of the view contended for by the then Dean of Faculty, now Lord Justice Clerk, who was counsel for the prisoner; namely, that the letter was *written* on the Friday, but *posted*, or at all events *stamped*, on the Saturday, and that the appointment made in it was for the Saturday and not the Sunday night. The letter itself was not dated.

Smith, who was tried for the murder, Not Proven. The nature of the proceedings in this remarkable case will exemplify the remarks we are anxious to make on the criminal jurisprudence of this country.

The subject of criminal procedure naturally divides itself into two parts: 1. The preliminary steps taken where a crime is alleged to have been committed, and before the accused party is brought to trial: 2. The conduct of the trial itself.

With respect to the first of these two divisions the Scotch system has been so clearly and ably detailed by Mr. Maccreiff, while holding the office of Lord Advocate under Lord Palmerston's Government, in his evidence given in 1855 before the 'Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Prosecutors,' that we cannot do better than quote the passage at length. He says:—

'The system proceeds upon the principle that it is the duty of the State to detect crime, apprehend offenders, and punish them, and that independently of the interest of a private party. The Scotch system acknowledges the right of a private person to prosecute; but the duty of the public prosecutor is altogether irrespective of that. The staff, if I may so call it, of the public prosecutor is as follows: the Lord Advocate is the head of the criminal department; under him he has four advocates-depute, and these do the business that a barrister properly does in criminal cases; their duty is to advise in the proceedings while they are going on, in the collection of evidence in the country, and, when the evidence is completed, to draw the indictment, and to attend the trial, and take the ordinary part in procuring a conviction.

'The means of detecting and punishing crime in the country consist, in the first place, of the Procurator Fiscal; there is a Procurator Fiscal for each county, and a Procurator Fiscal for some of the larger boroughs. In the counties he is appointed by the sheriff, in the boroughs he is appointed by the town council, but he is directly under the orders of the Lord Advocate and his deputies. The mode in which the system operates is this. The Procurator Fiscal receives information that a crime has been committed; his duty is to make immediate inquiry; if any person is suspected, he applies to the sheriff for a warrant to apprehend him; he does apprehend him, and the party is taken before the sheriff for examination, and upon that occasion the declaration is taken; the party is cautioned that he need not speak unless he likes, and then he is asked by the Procurator Fiscal, in the presence of the sheriff, any questions which seem to be material; and his answers are taken down and may be used against him in evidence. Then, if there appears to be ground for an immediate warrant to commit, he may be committed at once; the usual course is to commit him for further examination, and then the Pro-

curator Fiscal takes what is called a precognition; that is to say, he examines the witnesses whom he can discover, not publicly but privately; they are not properly depositions, but they are statements taken down by the Fiscal, and signed by the witnesses; and if the case is at all of importance to warrant it, he sends this precognition to the Crown agent. The witnesses may be examined on oath, but this is not usually done, unless the witness is reluctant. The precognition is sent by the Crown agent to the advocate-depute of the district in which the crime has been committed; it is his business to read it over, and if he is satisfied, may order no further proceedings, or he sends down to the Fiscal to have the party committed until liberated in due course of law, if that has not been already done, and proceeds to indict. Then the question is where the party is to be tried. He may be tried before the sheriff, or before the circuit, or before the High Court of Justiciary. If it is a small offence, such as an ordinary theft, the general course is, to send the party to be tried by the sheriff, either with or without a jury, and then the Procurator Fiscal attends and prosecutes. If, on the other hand, the party is an old offender, and he is indicted at the circuit, the advocate-depute attends. If it is a serious offence, or committed within the home circuit, he is tried before the High Court of Justiciary; and in that way it appears to me that the machinery works remarkably well. How it would do upon a larger scale, I can hardly say; but from Scotland being limited in extent, so far as my experience goes, I think it answers all the objects of such an institution very well indeed. I can say, from my own experience, that it operates fully as much in the protection of innocent persons against unfounded accusations, as it does in the detection of crime; and, for my own part, I think that the want of publicity in the first examinations, if you have, as we have, a sufficient check in the superintendence, such as I have described, tends very much indeed to the detection of the guilty: and I do not believe that our Procurators Fiscal would think it any advantage to have the witnesses examined in public. That is the system which we follow.

Mr. Moncreiff further stated, that the Procurator Fiscal is usually a leading attorney in the county town; that he is paid by salary in some cases, by fees in others; the advocates-depute are four, besides one for the Sheriff's Court; they are practising barristers, and reside in Edinburgh; and in the event of the advocate-depute refusing to prosecute, the Lord Advocate may be applied to, and he frequently orders him to report upon the case. All cases of any importance are considered personally, by the Lord Advocate or the Solicitor-General. Sometimes also, but very rarely, prosecutions by private parties take place.

To this we may ourselves add that even where the Crown counsel do not think fit to prosecute, and the accused person is discharged from commitment at their instance, the injured party

has still the right to prosecute at his own instance, with concurrence of the Lord Advocate, as it is technically called. This concurrence the Lord Advocate may be compelled by the High Court of Justiciary to grant, and in practice it is never refused. But the conduct of the case is then entirely under the control of the private party, who is liable for damages and expenses if it turns out that there is no reasonable ground for the prosecution. And he may be compelled to take an 'oath of calumny' that he has just reasons to prosecute, and that the facts charged in the indictment are, so far as he knows, true. In all cases the information or complaint to the Procurator Fiscal, by the express direction of the Statute of Anne in 1701, must be in writing, and signed by the party making it, without which a suspected person cannot be arrested; and the party so signing his name becomes responsible for the whole damages and expenses consequent on the imprisonment, if it proves to be groundless and malicious. But the Procurator Fiscal may be the informer by presenting to the Sheriff, who issues the warrant, a petition describing the offence and signed by himself.

In England the death of L'Angelier would immediately have been the subject of a coroner's inquest; but in Scotland there is no coroner. The only process at all analogous to it on this side of the Border is the investigation by the Procurator Fiscal put in motion by information he receives, that there are circumstances attending a decease such as to justify the suspicion of foul play, and amounting generally to a charge against some particular person. We think that the absence of a coroner's jury is a decided defect in our Scotch jurisprudence, although we are bound to add that some of the highest legal authorities in Scotland are of a different opinion, and would object to its introduction. In England every death which does not manifestly proceed from natural causes, including all cases of sudden death by accident or otherwise, is inquired into publicly by the coroner.*

* It appears from the Judicial Statistics of 1857 compiled by Mr. Redgrave and presented to both Houses of Parliament, that there were 20,157 inquests held in that year in England and Wales: 13,941 on males, and 6,216 on females. The per-centage of deaths herein included was as follows: murder, .91; manslaughter, 9.3; suicide, 6.69; accidental death, 44.3; injuries, causes unknown, 1.18; found dead, 14.63; and natural death, as from excessive drinking, &c., 31.38. The total expense of the inquests was 61,541*l.* 11*s.* 7*d.*; averaging 3*l.* 1*s.* 0*½d.* for each case. The Home Office deserves the highest credit for the admirable manner in which these Criminal Statistics are digested; and we are happy to find that measures have now been taken by Mr. Walpole, with the concurrence of the

He is *ex officio* bound to ascertain, as far as can be ascertained by evidence, what was the cause of death; and provided only he has notice of it, his duty requires him to summon a jury without waiting until he is called upon to do so by the friends or relatives of the deceased. This is an immense safeguard to the public, as it insures a searching investigation of the matter while the facts are recent,—the recollection of every one interested in the inquiry is fresh—and minute links in the chain of evidence can be most easily supplied. It may be said, indeed, that in Scotland also a similar examination takes place when the case is brought under the notice of the Procurator Fiscal, and that in England the coroner can only act when he knows that a death has occurred under suspicious circumstances, and this knowledge can only be obtained by information from others. But there is a wide difference between the two cases. An English coroner's inquest is primarily directed to investigate the fact of death and the cause of it; a Scotch precognition is directed against a supposed criminal, and if there be no suspected person, on whom does the precognition attach? The English form proceeds from the facts to the person of the criminal; the Scotch form proceeds from the suspected person to the facts. In Scotland the Procurator Fiscal does not act *ex mero motu*, like the coroner in England, whenever he hears of a suspicious death. He waits until something like a charge is made; and we know how unwilling persons often are to come forward and make such a charge, when the circumstances amount to no more than a suspicion of guilt. The consequence is that crimes must not unfrequently escape punishment from the absence of inquiry into the cause of death. It would be easy to adduce many cases in point upon this subject, but we will instance only one, which will be sufficient for our purpose.

Some time ago, in one of the southern counties of Scotland, a gentleman and his wife,—both of them somewhat advanced in years—resided on their own estate at a short distance from a market town. One daughter of about thirty years of age lived with her parents—the other children were settled in different parts of the world. This young lady was known for her bold and eccentric habits, and there was something coarse and repulsive about her. She had previously inherited a small independent property from an aunt, who died suddenly whilst she was staying in the house; and she was entitled to a share

courts of Law and Equity, which will ensure the preparation of complete Tables of the Statistics of Civil Justice from the present year.

of her father's estate on his death, which was then to be sold to pay off incumbrances and provide for the several children.

The father had long been an invalid, and it was therefore without surprise that the neighbours heard that he was attacked with a violent illness; but his wife, who was previously in good health, suffered at the same time and in the same manner from vomiting and internal disorder. A medical man was called in, and he continued to attend daily for a month at the house. The symptoms were those of poisoning by arsenic, as he himself admitted when afterwards questioned on the subject. He prescribed such remedies as he deemed proper, and the symptoms were checked for a time. But these remedies, and all the food which the patients took, were administered to them by the daughter, who never quitted the bedside of her parents. No second medical adviser was called in, and after a life-and-death struggle for about thirty days, both the father and mother expired nearly at the same time, and lay side by side in the same bed. The daughter exhibited the most violent and even extravagant grief, and flung herself on the dead bodies of her parents. No further inquiry whatever was instituted into the cause of their illness and death, although the circumstances were thought suspicious by all who knew them; and there is no doubt that the physician was in his own mind satisfied that there had been foul play. These suspicions were strengthened in a remarkable manner by the conduct of the young lady herself after she became her own mistress. She hastily got possession of her share of the property—flung herself into the arms of a profligate apothecary, with whom she eloped to France,—and after having spent the whole of her patrimony in two or three years, she terminated her own existence by poison.

This was a case which demanded the most searching investigation. The suspicions of the neighbours were aroused, and the medical attendant did not scruple in private to avow that the symptoms of the illness of both the parents were those of arsenical poisoning; and yet no steps were taken to clear up the mystery by a judicial inquiry. If such an event, with all the attendant circumstances, had happened in England, there would have been, beyond all doubt, a coroner's inquest held on the remains. The rumour would have reached that officer's ears even if, as is most likely, a direct communication were not made to him on the subject; and it would have been his duty immediately to summon a jury, and investigate the case. To set the inquiry in motion it would not have been necessary to make any accusation, but simply to state that the deaths were suspicious; and then the evidence adduced would have pointed

out the suspected party, who would have been apprehended, and, if the verdict of the jury justified it, would have been committed for trial. But in this case the fact of death by poisoning was never proved or legally investigated, and in the absence of that essential fact no proceedings were instituted against persons whom it was painful even to suspect of so horrible a crime.

But if the want of a coroner is a disadvantage, Scotland has the superiority over England in this important respect that she has a Public Prosecutor. Criminal trials here are conducted either by the Lord Advocate, or one of his advocates-depute, and he is thus directly responsible for the punishment of offences and the due fulfilment of the ends of justice. This duty he has discharged for nearly three centuries, if not longer; for by the Act of 1587 it is declared that 'the Thesaurer (Treasurer) and Advocate pursue slaughters, and other crimes, although the parties be silent, or wald otherwise agree.' The mode in which he acts has been already explained, and we will now proceed to consider some of its advantages, as contrasted with the absence of such an officer in England.

There the whole system, or rather want of system, in the conduct of prosecutions, is anomalous in the extreme. The conclusion at which the Commissioners on Criminal Law, in their Report of 1845, arrived, was, that 'The existing law is by no means as effectual as it ought to be: the duty of prosecution is usually irksome, inconvenient, and burthensome; the injured party would often rather forego the prosecution than incur expense of time, labour, and money. The entrusting the conduct of the prosecution to a private individual opens a wide door to bribery, collusion, and illegal compromises.' Lord Denman has recorded his opinion that 'our own procedure for the purpose of preliminary inquiry is open to great objection. The injured party may be helpless, ignorant, interested, corrupt; he is altogether irresponsible, and yet his dealing with the criminal may effectually defeat justice. On general principles it would evidently be desirable to appoint a public prosecutor.*' Lord Brougham stated before the Committee on Public Prosecutors (1855) that he agreed in this view; and Lord Campbell said that 'At present there is this great evil from the want of a public prosecutor in England, that the criminal law is often most shamefully perverted to mere private purposes.' To this the present Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, then Attorney-General, added, that Lord Campbell had twice publicly from the bench addressed him in

* Eighth Report of the Commissioners on Criminal Law, 1845.

court as Attorney-General, and pointed out the necessity of having a public prosecutor to prevent scandals in the administration of justice.

It would be strange indeed if it were otherwise, considering the hap-hazard mode in which criminal prosecutions are taken up and conducted in the English courts. It would be difficult to make an intelligent foreigner believe that in ordinary cases it is left very much to chance to determine, not only who the prosecutor shall be, but whether there shall be any prosecution at all. Except in cases of high treason or sedition, or offences against the revenue, it is no part of the official duty of the Attorney-General to institute a prosecution, although it frequently happens that he does, so when a crime of more than usual magnitude has been committed, or when the offence is one in which the public take an unusual degree of interest. Such, for instance, was the prosecution of the surgeon Palmer for poisoning with strychnine, and the still more recent cases of the delinquent bankers, and the directors of the Royal British Bank.

But in all other cases it is left to the committing magistrate to determine who the prosecutor shall be. Sometimes it is the party injured, or, if he be dead, his friends or representatives. Sometimes it is the policeman who has been employed to investigate the case, and get up, as it is called, the evidence. And often the prosecution is dropped altogether because nobody feels sufficient interest to go on with it. It must also be borne in mind that although the Crown is always nominally the prosecutor, and the two parties at the trial are the Queen and the prisoner, yet in reality where there is a private prosecutor, the conduct of the case is left entirely to him, and he employs his own attorney to prepare the evidence and retain counsel.

Moreover there is no settled rule applicable in all places alike; and in consequence there is no uniformity of system throughout England. Mr. Waddington, Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, states in his evidence that an uncertainty exists as to the mode in which a particular prosecution may be followed out — it varies in every borough; the practice of the metropolitan districts is different from that of the counties. It is, he says, irregular and anomalous, although he was not prepared to state from facts within his cognisance that there is any general failure of justice, though from the irregularity of the system such might be expected.

Surely such a state of things as this is discreditable to English jurisprudence. It may be alleged indeed of it, as has been so often said of many of our institutions, that the practice is better than the theory. And this is true; for in theory it

seems utterly indefensible, and yet we know that prosecutions are conducted with fairness, and convictions are obtained, and crime is punished and repressed. But it is impossible, in the face of such evidence as has been here adduced—the evidence of men above all others competent to form an opinion upon the merits and demerits of our system,—to maintain that no change is necessary, and to acquiesce in the conclusion that, after all, it works well. It does *not* work well when it produces such results as have been shown to exist, and all that can be said in its favour is, that much more evil might be expected to flow from it than experience tells us is actually the case. There is a corrective in public opinion declaring itself through the medium of the public press, which prevents many abuses which would otherwise be the almost inevitable consequence of such defects.

Now contrast the laxity of the English system with the vigilance and precision of the Scotch. And it has this further advantage, that it affords the strongest possible security against persons who are not guilty having to undergo the pain and disgrace of a criminal trial. A responsible public officer, of the highest legal attainments, has the case and the evidence laid before him, and if he is of opinion that the facts do not warrant an indictment, the accused person is at once set at liberty. In England there is indeed the intervention of the grand jury, but between the commitment of a prisoner for trial by a magistrate and the preferring of the bill against him before the grand jury, a *period of seven or eight months* may elapse, during which he will be incarcerated, although the grand jury may then determine that there is not even a *prima facie* case against him. And it must be confessed that an innocent man is not always safe in the hands of that body, invaluable as the institution is on many accounts. A striking instance of this was mentioned by Lord Brougham, in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1855:—

‘Mr. Blundell, of Ince, a Roman Catholic gentleman of old family and considerable estate in Lancashire, was put upon his trial at Lancaster for murder, and held up his hand in the dock, as was then the practice. The murder which the grand jury conceived to have been committed by him was this: There was a road in repair upon his estate, and his bailiff had omitted, in throwing a rope across the road in order to prevent access, to put a lantern, and an old woman coming from market at night in a donkey cart, tripped over this rope, for want of a light, and broke her neck, and unfortunately was killed. The grand jury considered, in the first place, that this was murder; and in the next place, that it was murder by Mr. Blundell, perpetrated by the negligence of his bailiff. The case was opened before Mr. Baron Wood, who, after he had heard the facts, imme-

distastefully said, "Are the grand jury discharged? go and see." The grand jury were discharged, and could not be found. "I am very sorry for it," he said, "this is a most shameful case." Mr. Blundell was, of course, acquitted; but he went down to the grave with the stigma of having held up his hand on a charge of murder, in the dock, among felons at the Lancaster assizes.

Public attention has lately been directed to the question of the expediency of an entire change of system in this respect, and a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1855, for the special purpose of considering the subject. The plan which they propose in their report, is in substance the following:—

They recommend that agents should be appointed, one to each of a certain number of districts, for the purpose of preparing and conducting prosecutions to the time of trial, and that these districts should be as coextensive with the jurisdiction of the existing County Courts as may be, regard being had to the integrity of counties. The duty of these district agents should be to prepare and conduct prosecutions through the stages preliminary to trial. Where it comes to their knowledge that an offence has been committed, and that no steps have been taken to bring the offender to justice, it will be their duty to take the necessary steps for bringing the offender before a magistrate; or if the party have already been apprehended, and the case is one of any difficulty or importance, they are to take upon themselves the further conduct of the prosecution, and prepare the evidence.

The Committee propose that a counsel of not less than ten years' standing shall be appointed for each circuit, to be the advising counsel for that circuit; and that to him the agents for the districts within that circuit shall resort for advice and directions in all cases of more than ordinary difficulty. These advising counsel are to communicate with, and act under the directions of, the Attorney-General, forming as it were the staff of that officer in the administration of criminal justice.

Individuals, however, instituting prosecutions are not to be prohibited from employing their own attorneys and counsel, or to be compelled to resort exclusively to the public prosecutor. But with a view to prevent the compromises which are sometimes resorted to for purposes of private interest, and to ensure the effective administration of justice, they recommend that it should be compulsory on an attorney employed to conduct a prosecution, to give notice to the district agent of his intention to prefer an indictment, and that the latter should have authority to intervene.

In Scotland, as we have already shown, the Lord Advocate

discharges the functions of public prosecutor, and it does not seem that any change in that respect is necessary or desirable. But the population of England is immensely greater than that of Scotland; and the duties of the Attorney- and Solicitor-General are so multifarious and heavy, that we much doubt whether it would be expedient, or indeed possible, to impose upon them the burden of such an office as that of Public Prosecutor. Still less would it be possible for the Lord Chancellor to undertake the duty. Our own opinion is, that some great officer of state ought to be appointed to superintend the whole department of Criminal Justice, with functions in some degree analogous to those of the French Minister of Justice; and if it be not thought expedient to carry into effect the resolution of the House of Commons which recommended the creation of a new department of Government for this purpose, we conceive that the same duties might be effectually performed by some augmentation of the powers and staff of the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

The next point deserving of notice in the Scotch and English systems is the difference in the mode of examining the suspected party before he is finally committed.

At the trial of Madeleine Smith, the first witness called was the sheriff-substitute of Lanarkshire, who gave the following evidence:—

‘I know the panel. She was judicially examined before me, and emitted a declaration on the 31st March. She was examined on the charge of murder before her declaration was emitted. The greater part of the questions at the examination were put by me. The statements made in the declarations, were all given in answer to questions. The answers were given clearly and distinctly. There was no appearance of hesitation or reserve. There was a great appearance of frankness and candour. The declaration is of considerable length.’

—and the declaration was read in Court as if it had been a spontaneous and continuous narrative, without the questions put by the sheriff, to which, in fact, it was a series of answers.

The law of Scotland requires that the declaration must be taken in the presence of the magistrate and two other witnesses, who subscribe with him the attestation at the end, setting forth that it was freely and voluntarily emitted in the sound and sober sense of the declarant. The precognition of the witnesses is taken afterwards, *in the absence of the accused*, who is not allowed to be present himself, or to have any one to attend on his behalf to cross-examine them, it being one of the directions of the Justiciary Court, in 1792, for the taking of precognitions, that ‘none

‘be present with the clerk at the examination of the persons cited by the sheriff to give up *dittay*.’

It is urged in defence of this system that it has the advantage of preventing publicity to the injury of the accused, in cases where it turns out that the charge is unfounded, and no further proceedings are taken. And we may freely admit that this is true. But, on the other hand, there are grave objections to such a mode of preliminary examination. It is too much like putting the accused *au secret* under the old French system before the Revolution. It is essential to the purity of the administration of justice in all countries, and at all times, that there should be no secret tribunal before which an accused party can be called upon to appear to give evidence against himself. Every step in the inquiry when he is present should be taken openly and *coram populo*. And this on two grounds: first, as giving him protection against the possibility of any improper practices; and next as affording the best security that the judicial officer will perform his duty not only with fairness, but efficiency. The Scotch law, indeed, requires the presence of two other witnesses besides the sheriff or sheriff-substitute, for the purpose of proving that the declaration was ‘emitted’ freely and voluntarily, and as a guarantee of its genuineness; but this does not deprive the proceeding of the air of privacy and mystery which hangs over it.

It is difficult therefore for those who are accustomed to the publicity that prevails in England to acquiesce in the conclusions of a high authority on Scotch Criminal Law, that ‘the strict seclusion of the prisoner in the interval between arrest and commitment to stand trial, and the *ex parte* nature of all proceedings in precognition, is essential to the great objects of Criminal Jurisprudence, the conviction of the guilty, and the speedy liberation of the innocent prisoner.’* On the contrary, we should be much more disposed to agree with the opinion of Lord Brougham, who, in his evidence before the ‘Committee on Public Prosecutors, in 1855, said:—

‘There are great inconveniences, no doubt, in the publicity of the examination; there is very great hardship to the party brought before the magistrate in its publicity; there is very great annoyance and hardship to the witnesses and to the prosecutor, who are brought before the magistrate, no doubt; but against all that, one cannot help setting the great advantage of the publicity of the proceeding, both preventing any malpractices by placing the magistrate, who is then the Court, in the eye of the public, and also by the great benefit which arises with a view to police, from its tendency to discover evidence, and to enable the parties prosecuting to be put upon

* Alison's Pract. Crim. Law, chap. v. 14.

the traces to find witnesses; so that, upon the whole, I have no doubt whatever that the benefits exceed the disadvantages of a public examination.'

Lord Campbell has graphically described the state of things that existed in this country in the last century: — 'Formerly the squire sat in his hall, and he had for his clerk his gamekeeper, and they had in the poacher before them, and they did with him what they liked.*' And although we perfectly well know that the privacy of the examination in Scotland does not lead to abuse like this, it is very desirable that so delicate a matter as the interrogatory of a party as a witness against himself should be surrounded with all the safeguards which publicity can alone supply.

The practice, however, is not peculiar to Scotland. It prevails in France, and Germany, and Italy, and indeed is common to all the countries of Continental Europe. In France the interrogatory is conducted privately by the *juge d'instruction*, and the accused is not confronted with the witnesses, who are examined separately; nor is he allowed at this stage of the proceedings to be assisted by counsel. And the old French law went so far as to require him to take an oath that he would speak the truth when questioned against himself.

In England nothing of the kind is known. An accused person there is brought before a magistrate in open Court, confronted with the witnesses, and asked whether he wishes to say anything, while he is at the same time cautioned that what he does say will be taken down in writing and hereafter made use of against him.† In Scotland, also, he is told that he need not speak unless he likes, and he is warned that his declaration will be used against him; but the difference between the two systems in this particular is not unimportant. In England no questions are addressed to the prisoner. If he makes any statement, it is not in answer to interrogatories, but is a spontaneous and voluntary act on his own part. In Scotland we see that, after being cautioned that he need not speak, he is asked by the Prosecutor Fiscal 'any questions which seem to be material.' Either, therefore, he remains silent altogether, or he answers the questions put to him; or he answers some of them and declines to answer others. It will be found, we believe, in practice a rare thing for a man

* Evidence before the Committee on Public Prosecutors, 1855.

† It is, however, right to notice, that by a late statute (11 & 12 Vict. c. 42. § 19.) the justices have the power to order that no person shall be present without their consent, 'if it appear to him or them that the ends of justice will be best answered by so doing.'

charged with an offence to remain wholly silent when pointedly interrogated, not as to its actual commission, but as to circumstances connected with it, the significance of which he may not immediately perceive. And if he does answer, the law is in fact extracting from him evidence against himself.

It may, however, be doubted whether the law of England does not carry tenderness towards a man accused of a crime too far. Provided he is not betrayed into a confession by holding out improper inducements, or coerced into it by practising upon his fears, there seems to be no reason why whatever he says against himself should not be put in evidence at his trial, although he may have had no warning that it will be made use of against him. It is only under an utterly corrupt system of jurisprudence that an innocent person will falsely criminate himself, thinking it perhaps safer to confess an offence which he has not committed, and sue for mercy, than to abide the result of a trial which he feels certain will terminate in a conviction. The Greeks and Romans resorted, in the examination of *slaves*, to the use of torture, and in the Middle Ages, and indeed in later times in Europe, this was the approved method of question in the case of all persons accused of crime. It does, indeed, seem marvellous that it should never have occurred to people in those days how utterly fallacious torture must be as a test of truth. It becomes a mere question of physical endurance, and under the pressure of intolerable pain the most innocent person may confess himself guilty, preferring speedy death to the prolonged agony of the rack or the wheel. At the present day in England the Courts of Law go to the contrary extreme, and the slightest inducement either of fear or hope held out to an accused party by any one whose position or authority may be supposed to exercise an influence over his mind, renders a confession inadmissible.* Every one who pays attention to the reports of criminal trials in the London newspapers, must be familiar with the way in which policemen who give evidence of confessions made by prisoners are attacked by counsel, and the severity with which they are handled when they have put questions to the accused with a view to elicit some statement from him; so that we can hardly be surprised at the answer which on one occasion a constable gave to the Court when he was asked whether the

* One of the most astounding instances of inducement held out to a prisoner to confess, occurred at the trial of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton for high treason, in 1554, when Lord Chief Justice Bromley thus addressed him: 'How say you, will you confess the matter, *and it will be best for you?*'

prisoner had not, while in his custody, made some admission of his guilt. He said, 'Oh no; he began to say something about it, but I knew my duty better, so I stopped him.' It is needless to add, that the constable was reprimanded for his officiousness; but his mistake was excusable, for he had so often heard his brethren assailed, and been so often assailed himself, for deposing to confessions, that he was determined to be on the safe side for once. We think that unless a confession, to whomsoever made, has been extorted by threats, or induced by a distinct promise to stay further proceedings, it ought to be received in evidence at the trial. And we assert this on the broad and intelligible ground that except in the cases already mentioned, it is absurd to believe that any sane man in this country will falsely accuse himself of a crime of which he is not guilty. At all events, in all cases it should be a question for the judge, at his *discretion*, to determine whether, under the circumstances the statement ought to be submitted to the jury.

With respect, however, to the general question of the expediency of judicially interrogating a person accused, it is difficult to see why, if this course of procedure is proper before the sheriff in Scotland, it should not also be allowed at the trial, as it is in France and other countries of Europe, where the judge examines the prisoner, and uses all his dexterity to make him convict himself of the crime with which he is charged. It is impossible not to be struck with the severity of the cross-examination which—not the witness but—the prisoner there has to undergo from the presiding judge, and the persevering ingenuity with which the latter tries to entrap him into admissions fatal to himself. He adjures, he apostrophises, he scolds, and does everything in his power to make him entangle himself in inconsistencies, and so betray his guilt.

'Is it not scandalous,' says De Quincey, in one of his essays, the subject of which is the trial and death of the Maid of Orleans, 'is it not humiliating to civilisation, that even at this day, France exhibits the horrid spectacle of judges examining the prisoner against himself; seducing him by fraud into treacherous conclusions against his own head; using the terrors of their power for extorting confessions from the frailty of hope; nay, which is worse, using the blandishments of condescension and snaky kindness for thawing into compliances of gratitude those whom they had failed to freeze into terror? Wicked judges! Barbarian jurisprudence! that, sitting in your own conceit on the summits of social wisdom, have yet failed to learn the first principles of criminal justice: sit ye humbly and with docility at the feet of this girl from Donrémy, that tore your webs of cruelty into shreds and dust. "Would you examine me as a witness against

myself?" was the question by which many times she defied their arts.'

It is, however, a mistake to suppose that the French law *enjoins* the interrogatory of the accused as a duty which the judge must perform. It only *permits* it, and reserves to him the right of choosing the moment when he thinks fit to exercise it. But inveterate usage has made it part and parcel of the system of procedure, and it is almost universally the practice to commence the trial by questioning* the accused before the witnesses are called. Counsel are expressly forbidden to answer for him, or to suggest anything to him at this stage of the proceedings*; but of course he is at liberty, if he likes, to refuse to answer the questions put to him, and in that case the evidence of the witnesses is taken at once.

Having regard, then, to the universality of this practice throughout the continent of Europe, it becomes a question well worth considering, whether it is right or wrong, and if right whether it ought to be introduced in Great Britain. Is it prejudice or sound reason that regards the questioning of a prisoner at his trial, as contrary to the principles of justice? And if not contrary to justice, is it not an efficacious means of arriving at the truth, and punishing the guilty?

It cannot be denied that the general impression is, that such a mode of proceeding is unfair. It seems to take advantage of a man who is no longer a free agent, to make, or endeavour to make, him supply against himself proofs which the law cannot otherwise obtain. We are apt to regard a criminal trial as a sort of duel between two adversaries — the law on the one side and the accused on the other — and it would be preposterous to ask one of two combatants to furnish weapons to the other to be used against himself. But is there not a fallacy in this mode of viewing the question? With regard to crimes, can there be any such thing as a right of concealment? The law may be powerless to *force* a confession — or it may, as in the case of torture, produce one which will be of no value, because it must always be uncertain whether it has not been wrung by agony from the lips of innocence — but ought it to refuse to interrogate the accused who, perhaps, alone of all persons in the world can give the information requisite to determine whether he is or is not guilty? We must of course assume, in the argument, that the examination is so conducted as to exclude the possibility of confounding innocence with guilt; and it is difficult to conceive how the answers given by

an innocent party to questions put to him, can be more dangerous to him than silence—which is one of the strongest presumptions of guilt. It is probable, indeed, that in some cases even when innocent, he would be unable to give a satisfactory explanation of facts which wear a suspicious appearance against him, but this would afford no greater presumption of guilt than exists where, in the same state of facts, he is not questioned at all. For the circumstantial evidence, remaining the same, the presumption of guilt is the same, whether the prisoner does not voluntarily offer to explain the facts, or in direct answer to a question says that he cannot explain them. It is, indeed, possible to suppose cases where a person may be stupid enough or frightened enough—although innocent—to give answers which may strengthen the suspicions against him. But this would generally happen only where the examination was badly conducted—or in the confusion of mind created by a sudden accusation—and is to the last degree unlikely to be the case at a trial presided over by a humane and enlightened judge, bent only on discovering the truth, and more anxious that the innocent should escape than that the guilty should suffer.

Even in France the theory of the system is, that the examination should be conducted with the most scrupulous fairness towards the accused. 'Je n'ai pas besoin,' says M. Berriat Saint-Prix, 'de parler de la loyauté qui doit présider à l'interrogatoire;' and he quotes the rule laid down by an old French jurist on the subject:—'Les questions que le juge fait à l'accusé doivent être claires, précises et sans équivoque; il doit surtout éviter de se servir de ruses et de discours captieux pour surprendre l'accusé. Outre que cette voie ne convient point à la dignité d'un magistrat, c'est qu'en usant de ce moyen, il paraît plutôt agir avec passion qu'animé du zèle et du bien de la justice.' But it must be admitted that this rule is not always observed. French judges, while rapidly interrogating the prisoner, are apt to be carried away by their feelings, which are excited by the sort of altercation that goes on between them, and questions are often put which, to English notions at all events, seem to the last degree unfair.

In his evidence before the Committee on Public Prosecutors, already referred to, Lord Brougham said that the worst of all the practice in the French procedure is 'the torture and question which the prisoner is put to upon his trial by the judge.' Upon which the Attorney-General (Sir A. E. Cockburn) strongly and truly remarked, that the judge constantly converts himself, in the sort of intellectual contest which goes on between them, into an advocate. But both these high

authorities confined their objection to the conduct of the examination by the *judge*. The Attorney-General asked Lord Brougham whether the interrogation of the prisoner might not be the very best means of ascertaining the true state of the case—not allowing the judge to interrogate the prisoner—whereby he forgets his judicial impartiality—but allowing the advocate, the public prosecutor, to put the questions? To which Lord Brougham answered, ‘*I am perfectly clear that some change in our law upon this subject, some relaxation, is absolutely necessary.*’ And he added that his objection to the French procedure was that it was the worst possible mode of doing it.

The next point of difference between the Scotch and English systems to which we will advert, is the notice required to be given to the accused, of the indictment on which he is to be tried, and the names of the witnesses who will appear against him. In Scotland a prisoner must be served with a copy of the indictment, a list of the witnesses, and the assize or jury which is to try him, fifteen days before the trial.

With respect to the list of witnesses, we think that the rule of notice ought to be limited by an important exception. It seems to be unwise and inexpedient to preclude a prosecutor from availing himself of testimony which may not be discovered until after the notice has been given. This must, in the nature of things, often occur; and it is difficult to see why it should not be made use of. *Nemo tenetur ad impossibile*—and it is impossible to give notice of that which is not yet known; but it is holding out a premium to guilt to refuse to admit evidence which, by the mysterious providence of God, may not be disclosed until the eleventh hour. The rule might well be that a list of all witnesses *known to the prosecutor* at the time should be furnished to the prisoner beforehand, under pain of having their evidence excluded—but it should always be open to him to avail himself of testimony which is not discovered until afterwards, and even while the trial is going on.

By the English law, in all criminal cases except high treason, witnesses may come forward at any moment before the case for the prosecution has closed. Some remarkable examples have occurred of the detection of guilt by this means. One instance must be fresh in every body’s recollection. We allude to the trial of Courvoisier for the murder of Lord William Russell, in 1840, who was convicted mainly by the evidence of a witness whose attention had been attracted to the report of the trial in a newspaper as it was going on, and who produced a parcel which had been left at her house by the prisoner, and which

contained articles that were identified as the property of the deceased. In Scotland, her testimony could not have been received; and very possibly the prisoner would have escaped.*

In point of fact, in England, except in the case of witnesses whose evidence is not known to the prosecution before the trial, and who unexpectedly then appear, the prisoner almost always knows not only the names of the witnesses who will appear against him, but the evidence they will give. This is owing to the practice which has sprung up of late years, of producing and taking the depositions before, the magistrate or coroner of every known witness who can possibly give evidence in the case, before the party accused of the offence is committed for trial. We cannot help thinking that this system has arisen from a misapprehension of what the English law requires. All that is necessary for the committing magistrate to ascertain is, whether there are fair and reasonable grounds for sending the case before a jury; and he steps beyond the boundary of his office when he does more than this, by going into all the minutiae of evidence, and sifting the case as closely as if he were called upon to decide the question of innocence or guilt. He has only to satisfy himself that there is sufficient *presumption* against the accused to justify the putting him upon his trial. The *proof* is afterwards a question for the jury.

It is said, indeed, that the course now always pursued is fairer towards the prisoner, as it prevents him from being taken by surprise at his trial, and gives him notice of the evidence which

* There is only one case in which by the English law an accused party is entitled to a list of the witnesses beforehand. Under the statute 7 Anne, c. 21., a person indicted for high treason, has a right to have a copy of the indictment and a list of the witnesses for the Crown, and of the jurymen who are to be returned on the panel, ten days before his arraignment. But in cases of *felony*, a prisoner, in England, has no right to see the indictment until after he has pleaded not guilty, and is put upon his trial; nor, in point of fact, does he see it beforehand. In some trials for *misdemeanour* it is different. For by stat. Geo. 4. c. 4. it is enacted that in all cases of prosecutions for *misdemeanours*, instituted by the Attorney- or Solicitor-General, the Court shall, if required, order a copy of the information or indictment, free of expense, to be given to the party accused, after appearance.

With respect to witnesses, although no list of those for the prosecution is furnished to a prisoner, except in cases of high treason, yet, practically, the same result is obtained by virtue of the statute 11 & 12 Vict. c. 42., which enacts that a prisoner may have, before his trial, copies of the depositions on which he has been committed, on payment of a reasonable sum for the same.

he will be called upon to meet. The reason is no doubt valid as far as it goes, and the Scotch system is based upon it. But there is an important difference in the preliminary proceedings in the two countries, which, in our opinion, renders the practice more objectionable in England. In Scotland, the examination of the witnesses for the prosecution beforehand, or their *precognition*, as it is called, takes place before the sheriff or Procurator Fiscal privately, the accused is not permitted to see it, and the public know nothing, except by rumour, of the particular facts to which the witnesses have deposed. In England, however, every word that is uttered by a witness in an important case before the magistrate or coroner is spoken in open Court, and is immediately reported in the newspapers. To such an extent is this now carried, that if we were to compare the evidence given before the committing magistrate in one or two notorious cases of late, with that afterwards given at the trials, we should find that the latter was nothing more than a repetition of the former, varied perhaps in some slight degree by the effect of a more searching and skilful cross-examination. One consequence of this is, that the public are called upon to 'sup full of horrors' twice instead of once, and the public mind is twice poisoned by the same details of crime. The subject is revived after it has been well nigh forgotten, and all the hideousness of vice is a second time laid bare. Another consequence of this extreme publicity is, that an opportunity is thus offered to the accomplices or friends of the accused to fabricate false evidence to meet the allegations which they know will be made against him, or to tamper with the witnesses for the prosecution. And this is no doubt the reason why the giving to a prisoner a list of witnesses before the trial has been called 'a mischievous invention, calculated to defeat 'the ends of justice.' But we are bound to admit, that experience has not shown that there is in the disclosure of evidence before trial any danger which need excite serious apprehension, for it is remarkable how seldom in this country a prisoner ventures to adduce evidence in his defence—a strong proof that in the great majority of committals, we believe an overwhelming majority, the presumption is that the accused is guilty.*

* In the Report of the Select Committee on Public Prosecutors (May, 1856) it is stated, that the proportion of convictions to acquittals is much greater in Scotland than in England. And yet in Scotland the list of witnesses for the prosecution is always given to the prisoner fifteen days before the trial.

In France notice must be given twenty-four hours at least before the trial, both by the *Procureur Général* to the prisoner and by the prisoner to the *Procureur Général*, of the names, occupations, and residences of the witnesses whom they respectively intend to call. But although this is the general rule, the French law takes care to provide for unexpected emergencies, and, by an express provision of the Code Criminel (art. 269.), the president at the trial has the power to call for any evidence, although not notified beforehand, which he thinks likely to be of use in throwing light upon the case. This is what seems to be required in the Scotch system, to prevent the failure of justice, which must necessarily sometimes happen, when witnesses against the prisoner come forward too late, and their testimony cannot be heard because their names have not been signified to him fifteen days beforehand. For clearly there ought to be in every system of jurisprudence the power of relaxing a rule with respect to the notification of witnesses beforehand, which, if rigidly observed, must often paralyse the arm of justice, and allow great crimes to escape punishment. We happen to know that, in the case of Madeleine Smith, an important witness was thus excluded, because the nature of his evidence was not known early enough for the legal notice to be given.

In England the indictment (we are not now speaking of criminal informations by the Attorney-General) must be found by a grand jury; but in Scotland there is no such body. In England the charge goes before the grand jury engrossed on parchment, which in that stage is called a bill; and it is not until they find a true bill that it is called an indictment. And in cases of murder or manslaughter, where there has been a coroner's inquest and verdict against the prisoner, notwithstanding the grand jury have not found the bill, it is competent to the prosecutor still to proceed upon the coroner's inquisition, and have the prisoner tried upon that. But this is by no means the usual course, and in most cases the practice is to take a verdict of acquittal on the coroner's inquisition, where the grand jury have not found a bill against the prisoner.

In the course of the trial of Madeleine Smith, her counsel, the Dean of Faculty, having applied for the warrant which had been issued for recovery of the documents which were put in evidence on the part of the prosecution, the Lord Advocate said that he had been anxious that every facility should be given for the defence, but the prisoner had chosen to run her letters, and the case had to be prepared in a very short time. The expression 'running her letters' is probably wholly unknown to

our English readers, and it may be useful to give some explanation of it.

When an accused person in Scotland is committed for trial, he has, under the statute of Anne, before referred to, the right to take out *letters of intimation* against the party on whose application he was imprisoned, and against the Lord Advocate. By these letters he requires that he shall be brought to trial within sixty days (the period prescribed by the Act), and that if that be not done, he shall be set at liberty. When these letters have been served upon the Lord Advocate, he is bound not only to execute an indictment against the prisoner within sixty days from the date of the service, but by a provision of the same statute, to bring the trial to a conclusion within forty days afterwards. If the indictment is not served upon the prisoner before the expiration of the sixty days, or the trial is not finished at the expiration of the hundred, he must be instantly set at liberty. The penalties for keeping him in prison after the expiration of either of these periods are fixed by the statute at certain sums for each day of the detention, and a large sum is given by way of damages;—neither of which, as the statute expressly declares, can be modified by any power or authority whatsoever. The power of ‘running letters’ therefore, under the Act of 1701, insures a prisoner being brought to trial, if he so wishes it, within a fixed period after his commitment.

In England there is no limit to the time within which a crime may be prosecuted after its perpetration, the maxim being that *nullum tempus occurrit regi*. In 1759 Horne was hanged for a murder committed in 1724, and in our own recollection a trial for murder took place twenty-four years after the murder was alleged to have been committed. But in Scotland it is held that the lapse of twenty years from the commission of an offence is a complete bar to criminal proceedings.* It would seem more reasonable to make the period of limitation run, not from the perpetration of the deed but from its discovery, for it is hardly possible to say that crime ought to go unpunished because for a certain length of time it has been successfully concealed. In the second case to which we have just alluded, and which was a very remarkable one, being the trial of the alleged murderer of

* The case which is generally cited as an authority for this is that of M'Gregor, in August, 1778; but there the prisoner's discharge was directed, ‘in respect it does not appear that any sentence of fugitation (or outlawry) passed against him.’ It seems, however, to be settled law in Scotland that a lapse of twenty years is a bar to a prosecution.

a murderer, the trial took place in 1830, and the double murder had been committed in 1806, but the remains of the deceased were not discovered until the end of 1829.

Another material point of difference in the procedure of the two countries lies in the indictment. We are not here alluding to mere difference in its form, and to what may be called its technical incidents, but to the substance of the matters that may be charged in it. The indictment against Madeleine Smith contained three distinct capital charges, on all of which she was tried at one and the same time. The first related to an administration of poison with intent to murder the deceased on the 19th or 20th of February; the second to a similar attempt on the 22nd or 23rd of the same month; the third to the actual murder of the deceased on the 22nd or 23rd of March following. By the English law the prisoner could not have been tried on more than one of these charges in the same indictment. They referred to separate offences alleged indeed to have been committed against the same person, but differing in time and place and circumstance; and they could not, according to the English practice, have been included together in the same indictment. But practically there is less difference between the two systems in this respect than may at first sight appear. By the English law it would have been perfectly competent to give evidence of the alleged prior attempts on the life of the deceased, on an indictment charging the prisoner with his murder on the 22nd of March, in order to show the probability that at that date the attempt was successfully renewed. Where the conduct of an accused party is ambiguous, his previous acts may be resorted to in order to explain it. Thus, where a man is indicted for the murder of another by shooting him with a gun, and the defence set up is that the gun went off by accident, it may be proved that on a former occasion, or on former occasions, the prisoner attempted to kill the deceased. But this is allowed merely to throw light on what is dark or equivocal, and is only relevant to prove malice on the part of the accused, and thus supply a link in the chain of proof which might otherwise be wanting to show the intent. In Scotland, however, a prisoner may be tried at one and the same time on several charges if they are connected together by one continuous crime, as a charge of murder with robbery, or theft with forgery. Indeed, according to the theory of Scotch law, as laid down by the best authorities, a prosecutor is allowed to include in the same indictment a number of offences which have no connexion with each other; as for instance treason, cursing of parents, and parricide; and the objection of *cumulatio criminum* is hardly

tenable. In one case, that of Dickenson and others, in 1726, the prisoners were charged with a murder committed in 1724, a robbery in 1726, and also with being 'sorners, Egyptians, and masterful beggars.' In another, murder, houghing of oxen and theft; and in another, fornication and theft have been included in the same indictment.* The same is the case in France, and any number of charges of the most dissimilar kind may be included in the same *acte d'accusation*. Thus, in the memorable case of Madame Laffarge,* she was tried not only for the murder of her husband, but also on the same indictment for the robbery of some jewels. It is impossible to defend such a mode of procedure. It is a monstrous perversion of justice to mix up incongruous charges, and call upon a prisoner to defend himself against them all at the same moment. For it is obvious how unfair an effect the minor accusation may have upon the major, by prejudicing the minds of the jury, and inducing them to come to the illogical conclusion that because a woman may have stolen diamonds she is therefore likely to have committed murder!

Another difference between the Scotch and English Courts in the conduct of a trial, is the order in which the speeches and evidence are interchanged.

In England the evidence is always preceded by an opening speech of counsel, who, by custom, except in cases where the Crown itself is not only nominally but actually the prosecutor (as where one of the law officers of the Crown officially conducts the prosecution), is not entitled to a reply unless the counsel for the prisoner calls witnesses or puts in evidence for the defence. In Scotland the evidence for the prosecution is given first, and this is followed by the evidence for the defence. The counsel for the Crown then for the first time makes a speech, summing up the evidence on both sides, and the prisoner's counsel replies, so as to have always the last word with the jury.† This is no doubt a great advantage to the accused, and perhaps is right, but it seems a mistake not to open the case with a statement. The jury are left to gather the facts solely from the indictment, and this affords really no information as to the history of the case, which may be of the most complex character. They must therefore be often lost in the labyrinth

* The Court, however, has the power to divide the indictment or libel, and try at one time only such charges as it thinks will not embarrass the prisoner in his defence.

† The counsel on either side may open by a speech if they choose, although in practice it is rarely done.

of details, without the clue which they would have held if they had been instructed by the opening speech of counsel.

Every reader of Demosthenes and the other Greek orators knows that it was the custom at Athens to mingle the speech of the prosecutor and evidence together; and the speaker constantly paused in his oration to direct the officer of the court to read such and such a document in evidence, or to call for the testimony of witnesses.

It can hardly be objected that by the English system there is more chance of a jury being misled than by the Scotch; for there is in reality as much scope for mis-statement or exaggeration in summing up evidence as in stating it beforehand. And in nothing perhaps is a prosecuting counsel in England more cautious than in not making any statements to the jury the truth of which he thinks may possibly not be established. Indeed, the humane spirit in which English trials are conducted, is remarkably shown in the fairness and moderation with which the counsel for the prosecution opens the case against the prisoner. The tone of his speech is almost judicial; avoiding all exaggeration, cautioning the jury against being influenced by anything except the evidence before them, and impressing upon them the duty of giving the prisoner the benefit of any reasonable doubt. The course adopted in France presents an amazing contrast to this; and we can only wonder when we read the speech of a *Procureur du Roi*, or *de la Republique*, or *Impérial* against the accused, full of impassioned oratory, and inflaming the charge against him with all the artifice of rhetoric.

But the French lawyers may plead illustrious precedents for this. They may appeal to the great orators of antiquity, who indulged in bitter invective when they conducted, as we should call it, a prosecution; and of this the speech of Cicero against Piso is a conspicuous example. Nor could anything exceed the vehemence of attack with which Burke and Sheridan, as managers of the impeachment against Warren Hastings, assailed him in Westminster Hall. But they were not lawyers, and the whole proceeding had more the character of a political and party struggle than a judicial inquiry.

But a much more important difference exists between the systems of Scotland and England in the application of the law of evidence. On the trial of Madeleine Smith, declarations made by the deceased at two different periods in February, when he was suffering from illness from which he recovered, to the effect that his illness was consequent on his taking something which the prisoner had given him to drink, were admitted in evidence against her

without any opposition on the part of her counsel.* These statements, if understood in the sense intended by the prosecutor, were of tremendous significance, and must have weighed heavily against the prisoner. If they had been excluded, it is hardly too much to say that the verdict must have been Not Guilty, for without them the case against her would have resolved itself into this:—She was proved to have purchased arsenic on three occasions, and on the hypothesis of the exclusion of L'Angelier's declarations in February, there would have been no evidence whatever to connect him in any way with the use made of the poison on either of the first two of these. Two days after the third purchase, she made an appointment to meet the deceased, which, owing to an accident, he failed to keep. The appointment was renewed for another night (Saturday, the 21st of March), and this again, owing to his absence from Glasgow, he failed to keep. On the following night he is proved to have gone from home as if to obtain an interview with the prisoner, but there was an utter absence of proof that they did meet on that occasion; and at two A.M. of that night he was found at the door of his lodgings suffering from the effects of arsenic, of which he died in the course of the day, without hinting in the remotest manner that he had seen the prisoner or received anything whatever from her. In this state of facts, the links which could connect the prisoner with his death would have been too glaringly wanting to justify even a verdict of Not Proven. The case, however, assumed a different aspect when evidence was given, the object of which was to show that on two previous occasions she had made attempts by poison on her lover's life. If the jury were satisfied of *that*, their minds would inevitably be predisposed to think that she would not scruple to make a third attempt, provided only she had the opportunity, and the only questions then would be—was the opportunity given? and were the attending circumstances such as to lead to a reasonable belief that she availed herself of it for that purpose?

By the English law, the above evidence was wholly inadmissible, and no lawyer would have attempted to tender it in a court of justice. True it is, that the declaration of a deceased person having reference to *the cause of his death*, and uttered under a consciousness or apprehension of approaching dissolution,

* It must, however, be borne in mind that this evidence was admitted on an indictment which charged the *attempt* as well as the actual murder. But the attempt was at a time long before the murder, and could not have been included in an indictment charging the murder according to the English law.

is received in evidence. But in the case in question, both these requisites of admissibility were wanting. The statements had reference to two alleged attempts upon his life from which he had recovered. They were in no sense the cause of his death, and they were separated by an interval of at least a month from that event. But what is of still more importance, they were made at times when the deceased was under no apprehension of death, and there was nothing to distinguish them from any other declaration he might have made affecting the prisoner at any period of his life.

The admission of dying declarations at all as evidence, is a relaxation of the rule that no hearsay evidence can be received. For such a statement is made in the absence of the accused behind his back, and there is no opportunity at the trial of cross-examining the party who has made it, inasmuch as by the hypothesis he is then dead. But the Scotch law goes further than the English, and where a person who has been injured by a crime is dead, it allows evidence to be given by third parties of what he has said with regard to the subject-matter of the trial, although the statement may have been made at a time when he was in perfect health, and in no fear of death. We confess we are unable to see how this can be justified on any principle which would not equally admit evidence of statements made by anybody who happens to die before the trial, although not the party injured. And yet such statements are by the law of Scotland equally, as by the law of England, excluded.

There is perhaps no part of the Criminal Law of Scotland which has attracted more attention in England than the verdict of Not Proven, corresponding to the *Non Liquet* of the Roman law. And there are not wanting those who advocate the introduction of it into the English Courts; nor are they without plausible arguments in its favour. We will therefore say a few words on the subject, and endeavour to show that such a verdict is on several grounds objectionable. But first as to its origin.

The old form of Scotch verdict for 'guilty' was *fyht, culpable, or convict*; and for 'not guilty,' was *clean, or free, and sometimes innocent*. And this verdict continued to be given until the latter part of the seventeenth century. It was, however, found that the jury sometimes took the law into their own hands, and acquitted the prisoner, not because the evidence was insufficient, but because they chose to consider that the crime charged in the indictment did not amount to a legal offence. It became, therefore, the practice in drawing the indictment to set out all the facts with circumstantial minuteness, and the Court then, in

the first instance, pronounced an interlocutor as to its relevancy, that is, its sufficiency in point of law, if proved in fact, to justify the conclusion that a legal offence had been committed. They afterwards, if the relevancy was sustained, referred it to the 'knowledge of the judge,' to determine the facts, and find them 'proven,' or 'not proven in the terms of the lords their interlocutor.' And they soon went a step further; for not content with allowing the jury to find as the *result* of the whole evidence a verdict of 'proven,' or 'not proven,'—when the Court suspected that the jury might scruple to find in general terms the crime charged to be *proven*, it required them to return a *special verdict*, finding proved a long chain of circumstances, and leaving it to the judges to determine whether, by inference, these did or did not establish the crime charged in the indictment. It is needless to say, that this was to usurp in a great measure the prerogative of the jury. For in criminal cases it is its especial province to draw inferences, not indeed of law, but of fact, from other facts; and very often the whole question of guilty or not guilty depends upon the inference to be drawn from particular circumstances. For instance, the inference of intention, which makes all the difference between murder or manslaughter, or accidental death. To show to what a length this was carried, we may mention the case of Marion Lawson, who was tried for child murder in 1662. The jury found her to be *cleared and not guilty in respect of no probation*; but in respect of the presumptions, remitted the prisoner to the consideration of the Court, and the Court sentenced her to be whipped through the High Street of Edinburgh, and banished, for an offence of which, in the opinion and by the verdict of the jury, she was not proved to be guilty! Thus the verdict of 'proven' and 'not proven,' took the place of the old forms, and they continued until the trial of Samuel Hales, in 1726, when the jury, for the first time we believe since the commencement of the new practice, returned a verdict of 'not guilty.' And two years afterwards, the case of Carnegie of Finhaven occurred, who was tried for the murder of the Earl of Strathmore, when, in opposition to the opinion of the Court, the jury thought that the panel was not guilty of murder, and they, 'therefore,' says Baron Hume, 'asserted their ancient and undoubted privilege of finding a general verdict of *not guilty*, which the Court could neither decline to receive, nor anywise question as to the grounds and reasons on which it proceeded.' The legal effect of a verdict of 'not proven,' is the same as that of 'not guilty'; for the accused cannot be tried a second time.

The popular objection to the verdict of *Not Guilty*, as distinguished from *Not Proven*, is that it seems sometimes to do

violence to the consciences of jurymen, who, as is alleged, must be not unfrequently morally satisfied of the prisoner's guilt, or, at all events, not satisfied of his innocence; and yet, owing to a defect of legal evidence, or to some technical quibble, are compelled to declare that they do not believe he has committed the offence for which he is tried. But this is a mistake; for by the verdict of *Not Guilty*, the jury do not necessarily assert that they believe the prisoner to be innocent of the crime imputed to him. It does not in itself imply more than that the *legal evidence* is not sufficient to produce that degree of certainty which would justify, or render safe, a conviction. And a proof of this is furnished by the fact, that the verdict is returned in cases where the guilt of the accused is established, but owing to some technical difficulty or mistake, the jury are directed to acquit. They do not thereby say that he has not committed the crime, but merely that it is not legally proved that he has. There is, therefore, nothing in the verdict which need alarm the most scrupulous conscience; for it may be, and indeed ought to be, given whenever a juror is not fully and beyond all reasonable doubt satisfied by legal evidence of the guilt of the accused. And we must remember, that the law presumes every man to be innocent who is not proved to be guilty; so that the jury do no more than their strict duty when they declare him to be not guilty whom the evidence falls short of convicting, however dark and unfavourable may be their suspicions respecting him.

Such, then, being the case with respect to the verdict of *Not Guilty*, it is not difficult to show that there are grave objections against that of *Not Proven*. It is in fact what Sir Walter Scott called it, 'a bastard verdict.' It enables jurors to effect a sort of compromise between their duty to give a true verdict 'according to the evidence,' and their inclination to escape the necessity of coming to a definite conclusion upon doubtful facts. There must be always a strong temptation to adopt it where there is much suspicion, but a deficiency of legal proof. But is this fair towards the accused? Surely if the evidence does not establish the charge against him, he is entitled to an absolute acquittal. But although the verdict of *Not Proven* is so far tantamount to an acquittal, that the party cannot be tried a second time, it falls very far short of it with regard to the effect upon his reputation and character. He goes away from the bar of the Court with an indelible stigma upon his fame, when there stands recorded against him the opinion of a jury, that the evidence respecting his guilt was so strong that they did not dare to pronounce a verdict of acquittal. But where the evidence falls short of *proof* of guilt, the prisoner is

entitled to a verdict of Not Guilty; for the law has failed to prove him guilty, and by the law alone is he to be acquitted or condemned.

We had intended to discuss at some length the question of the unanimity of the jury, the requirement of which Mr. Hallam calls a 'preposterous relic of barbarism;' but we have only space for a few concluding remarks.

In Scotland the jury or assize in criminal trials consist of fifteen, and decide by a majority. In England the verdict must be unanimous. In France, between 1791, when the jury system was first introduced there, and 1848, a period of fifty-seven years, the law respecting verdicts by a majority in criminal cases was changed no less than twelve times! At first (Décret. 16 et 29 Sept. 1791, C. Brum. an 4. art. 403.) ten votes were required for a verdict of Guilty. Under the Revolutionary Tribunal the number of the jury was reduced to eleven, then to nine, and afterwards to seven, and it was necessary that there should be a majority for a verdict, either of Guilty or Not Guilty. The Directory required the verdict to be unanimous in either case. Other changes took place at different periods; and under the Republic that followed the revolution of February, 1848, the majority was required to be nine. This, however, was found to lead to an alarming number of acquittals, and finally the law of the 9th of June, 1853, established the rule of a simple majority for a verdict of Guilty, which continues up to the present time.

We must here content ourselves with expressing our opinion, that the rule of unanimity ought to be relaxed in civil and retained in criminal cases. As regards the former, a change was strongly recommended by the Commissioners appointed in 1830 to report upon the Courts of Common Law. They said, 'It is essential to the validity of a verdict that the jury should be unanimous; and regularly they are not allowed to be discharged (unless by consent of the parties) until such unanimous verdict has been returned. It is difficult to defend the justice or wisdom of the latter principle. It seems absurd that the rights of a party on questions of a doubtful and complicated nature should depend upon his being able to satisfy twelve persons that one particular state of facts is the true one. . . . *And the interests of justice seem manifestly to require a change of law upon this subject.*'

This was the declared opinion of the Commissioners, published twenty-seven years ago, and yet no change has been made in the rule that requires twelve men all to agree upon a disputed fact, or leaves the fact for ever judicially undecided. Surely the time has come when such an absurdity should no

longer be permitted to continue, and when the law of the majority, which prevails in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and in every other assemblage of men who meet to deliberate and determine, should be allowed to prevail in the jury-box. But we do not wish to see the English rule changed in criminal trials, for here different considerations apply. We have not space to discuss the question here, but we may shortly state, that what chiefly weighs with us in adopting this conclusion, is, that the fact of a dissentient minority in a verdict of Guilty must often tend to paralyse the arm of justice, and produce a sort of compromise in the infliction of punishment, which cannot be justified on any ground of principle. We doubt whether in England it would be possible to hang a prisoner for murder when the jury found him Guilty only by a majority. And yet, on what principle could a lesser punishment be inflicted? If the Executive is satisfied that the verdict is right, the law (except so far as *mercy* may intervene) ought to take its course. If it doubts because the jury differed in opinion, and therefore remits the penalty of death, surely it has no right to consign a man to hopeless slavery for life, when it did not dare to hang him because it doubted whether he was guilty at all. But however opinions may differ as to the expediency of the rule which requires unanimity in the jury, either in civil or criminal trials, there surely can be none as to the absurdity of that which prohibits them from receiving any kind of refreshment while they are considering their verdict. They must agree or starve, not exactly to death, but up to a considerable amount of endurance of physical exhaustion. This undoubtedly is a 'preposterous relic of barbarism;' and the only wonder is, that it should have remained to the present day, and be tolerated in times when mere antiquity is allowed to be a very insufficient plea for the continuance of an abuse.

ART. III.—*History of Ancient Pottery*. By SAMUEL BIRCH,
F.S.A. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1858.

THERE are few things with which we are less accustomed to associate the idea of permanence and indestructibility than with any kind of earthenware. Crockery seems made to be broken. The earthen jar in the fable is the very type of fragility; and we have all had painful experience how rapidly the plates of our best dessert service and our prettiest tea-cups disappear; how surely, even the most careful housemaid will, on some unlucky day, find her mistress's favourite china 'come in 'two in her hand.' And yet, despite of housemaids — whom we take to have been of much the same clay in all ages — there is scarcely any record of past civilisation so permanent, hardly any sign of the habitation of ancient races so indelible, as the remains of their pottery. The explanation is simple. It is indeed easily broken, but not easily destroyed. The fragments remain, because no one cares to gather them up. They are thrown aside as worthless; they cannot be melted down like gold or silver, or burnt into lime like marble; they do not oxidize or decay under the influence either of the atmosphere or the earth; and there they lie, neglected and forgotten by successive generations till they attract the eye of the antiquarian in some distant age. All visitors to Rome will remember that a considerable hill — the Monte Testaccio — is composed of nothing but broken earthenware; and the site of ancient Alexandria is covered to a great depth with the accumulated fragments of pottery of all ages, from the foundation of the city downwards. In this country there is hardly a spot, once occupied by the Romans, which has not yielded with more or less abundance the red Samian ware, characteristic of that people; while the much more ancient sites of cities in Italy — cities that had perished long before the Romans rose into power, and of which there does not now remain one stone upon another — are still identified by broken pottery, 'the infallible indicator of bygone civilisation.'

Nor is this all. It is not merely a mute witness that something has been there — that long ages ago men dwelt upon that spot, who were acquainted with the arts of civilised life — but it often serves to bring us a message from the past which would otherwise have been entirely forgotten. The broken wine-jars of Alexandria have afforded to the diligent researches of recent antiquarians much curious information as to the commercial re-

lations of that city with other Greek states *; and the painted vases discovered in the tombs of Campania and Etruria serve to throw new light upon the history of ancient art, and supply valuable contributions to our knowledge of Greek mythology.

There are indeed few relics of antiquity which have of late years attracted more attention among continental archæologists than the vases just referred to, especially since the extraordinary number of them discovered at Vulci, in Etruria, about thirty years ago, at once re-awakened the curiosity of the learned, and gave a stimulus to the zeal of the excavator and collector. In this country, on the contrary, the subject has hitherto attracted but little interest. A large number of the choicest vases from Vulci have indeed found their way into the British Museum, as well as into the hands of private collectors. But it has fared the same with this branch of antiquities as with the kindred study of numismatics. Valuable and costly collections have been formed, but little pains have been taken to illustrate them by literary research, or to publish to the world the treasures thus accumulated. 'In England' (Mr. Birch justly observes) 'neither public patronage nor private enterprise has undertaken works equal to those published on the continent.' Indeed, we believe that the '*Ancient Unedited Monuments*,' published by Millingen in 1822, is the last work of consideration that has appeared in this country upon the subject of painted vases; and this was prior to the remarkable discoveries at Vulci, and to the long series of rescarches to which the archæologists of France and Germany were led by those discoveries.

The work of Mr. Birch is not designed to supply this deficiency, or to compete with the learned and elaborate publications of MM. Gerhard and Panofka in Germany, or of MM. Lenormant and De Witte in France. It proposes rather to review the whole field of the ceramic arts among ancient nations, and to supply us with a convenient manual for reference and guide in our researches. Such a manual was much wanted; and it is with great regret that we find this want imperfectly supplied by the long-expected volumes that are now before us. Mr. Birch is singularly deficient in the power of putting his ideas before the reader in that clear and lucid manner which is the most essential requisite of a popular handbook; and while he has availed himself with considerable

* See the valuable memoirs of Mr. Stoddart, in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, vols. iii. and iv., New Series. A summary of the results is given by Mr. Birch.

diligence of the materials accumulated by continental writers, he has but too often failed to digest them into a shape intelligible to the uninitiated reader. We miss throughout his work both the independence of judgment and the clearness of view which are essential to the arrangement of such materials in an available form. The unlearned inquirer — and it is for this class that a work like the present should be chiefly adapted — will find himself bewildered by the conflicting views of different archæologists, without any clue to guide him out of the labyrinth. Not unfrequently, indeed, we find two discordant statements upon some controverted point, introduced by Mr. Birch in successive portions of his work, without any attempt to reconcile, or even to point out, the discrepancy.* On the other hand, the archæologist and the scholar will be often startled by inaccuracies in historical statements and glaring chronological errors, which must in fairness be imputed to haste and carelessness — for we cannot suppose them to proceed from ignorance — but which do not the less interfere with the utility of the book as a work of general reference.†

* A striking instance of this inconsistency occurs in vol. ii. p. 154., where he tells us that Nola 'was certainly not an Ionian colony,' though in the very next page he states that it 'was a colony of the Chalcidian Greeks.' Yet he must surely have known that Chalcis was an Ionic city, and that if Nola was a Chalcidic colony, it certainly *was* an Ionic one. But in the first passage he is following Kramer, who denies the Chalcidic origin of Nola; while in the second he copies without hesitation from Gerhard, who accepts the tradition that it was a colony of Chalcis. Mr. Birch has simply inserted the two statements without observing that they are contradictory. No such excuse can be made for the astounding assertion (vol. ii. p. 173.) that Agragas (Agrigentum), one of the most purely and essentially *Doric* of all the Greek cities in Sicily, was an *Ionic* colony.

† Nor are these instances of carelessness and inaccuracy confined to matters which may be considered extraneous to his immediate subject: they are not less frequent in questions closely connected with the history of the art itself, where they are peculiarly liable to mislead the unwary reader. Two instances may suffice. In vol. i. p. 314., where he is describing the celebrated François vase, he tells us 'that it was the work of the artist Ergotimus, while its shape 'was moulded by the potter Clitias;' the fact being, as Mr. Birch himself informs us elsewhere (vol. ii. pp. 48. 61.), that the potter's name was Ergotimus, and Clitias was the artist who painted it. Again, in vol. ii. p. 151., in a passage where he is contrasting the vases found at Nola with those from Vulci, he *writes* Vulci where he *means* Nola, and has thus thrown the whole passage into confusion.

It would far exceed the limits we can devote to this subject to enter upon anything like a systematic review of the various topics of interest connected with the painted vases of the ancient Greeks; all that we can attempt is to draw the attention of our readers to a few of the principal points, and indicate to them the wide field of research that this department of archæology opens to those who have the courage to undertake its exploration.

There are few nations in so imperfect a state of civilisation that they do not possess some kind of earthen vessels for domestic use. The Indians of North America, as well as the earliest inhabitants of our own island, were acquainted with the art of making a kind of rude pottery suited to the purposes of a barbarous people. But it was the invention of the potter's wheel which could alone lead to the development of these rude beginnings into an art adapted to the requirements of civilised life; and this first step was taken at a period so early that all trace of its origin is lost. The discovery was indeed claimed by the Athenians, and their pretensions seem to have been generally admitted by the Greeks*, though this may have been more out of deference to their acknowledged excellence in the manufacture than from any real foundation for the assertion. It is, however, an incontestible fact that the use of the potter's wheel was known to the Greeks as far back as we possess any records of their social condition. It is alluded to by Homer as a familiar illustration†; and the earliest and rudest earthen vessels which have been discovered in Greek sepulchres—vessels of so simple and primitive a character that they have been considered to belong to the heroic ages‡—are nevertheless the production of a people already familiar with this important invention.

There is no doubt that the discovery was known to the Egyptians long before the first dawn of Greek civilisation. The potter's wheel, and all the ordinary processes of the manufacture, are represented in paintings on the tombs at Beni Hassan, which are referred to a period more than two thousand years before the Christian era; and vases of red earthenware

Such mistakes as these might be easily corrected in a future edition; but the prevailing obscurity of Mr. Birch's style, and the haziness of his views, could only be removed by *rewriting* the book.

* Critias, *ap. Athenæum*, i. p. 28. But the invention was claimed also by the Corinthians.

† *Iliad*, xviii. 600.

‡ See a paper by Mr. Burgon, in the second volume of the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, New Series.*

have been found in Egyptian sepulchres of almost all ages. It is much more remarkable that this singular people had made a nearer approach to the invention of true porcelain than was attained by any European nation till quite modern times. But they stopped just short of the point which would have rendered the discovery available for purposes of general utility; and the process which had been long known in the remote empire of China, remained a secret to the nations of Europe till the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Familiar as the Egyptians may have been from the earliest period with the simpler kinds of pottery, they seem to have taken but little pains to cultivate and improve the art, which they applied chiefly to the manufacture of utensils for domestic purposes, very similar to those that have continued to be made in Egypt down to the present day.* Those of a better description were made of a kind of polished red earthenware, which might seem to have been the prototype of the Samian ware of the Romans, and was undoubtedly well adapted for domestic use. But little attempt at decoration is found; and the forms of the vessels have generally as little pretension to beauty or elegance as those which were common in this country before the days of Wedgwood.

Although the Greeks had no real claim to be regarded as the inventors of the art of pottery, they were unquestionably the first to elevate it from a rude handicraft to a branch of the fine arts. Not only did they introduce great improvements in the merely mechanical parts of the manufacture, and produce earthen vessels far surpassing in fineness of texture and perfection of workmanship anything that had been before known, but with that pure taste which distinguished all their productions, they refined and improved the forms of the vessels themselves, until these assumed an elegance and a purity which have rarely been approached, and certainly never surpassed, by any modern people. But not content with this, they introduced at a very early period a style of ornament, by painting the exterior of the vases, which continued to keep pace with the subsequent progress of Greek art through all its successive changes. Hence the painted vases of the Greeks are not only of interest for their own intrinsic beauty of form and design, but still more as affording us a valuable auxiliary in tracing the history of the fine arts among that highly-gifted people. Beginning with the first rude imitations of the stiff and conventional forms of Oriental art, we can follow them step by step, till they emerged into the full and free development of their native genius.

* Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, vol. iii. p. 163.

The assistance of the vases is in this respect the more important to us, because they tend to fill up what would otherwise be an irreparable gap in our knowledge of ancient art. For the extant relics of Greek sculpture—few and fragmentary as they undoubtedly are—are yet in some degree sufficient to enable us to judge of the works of the ancient masters in this branch of art. The metopes of Selinus, — the Æginetan, the Elgin, and the Phigaleian marbles—to which we may now add the noble fragments recently brought to this country from Halicarnassus—not only serve to give us a clear and definite idea of the progress of the art of sculpture, but enable us to estimate for ourselves the mighty works which were so celebrated in antiquity. But the painters of ancient Greece—the contemporaries of Phidias or Praxiteles and their rivals in fame—are wholly lost to us. A few scanty notices and apocryphal anecdotes preserved by Pliny and other late writers, and a dry description of some individual works by Pausanias, are all that remains of Polygnotus or Parrhasius, of Zeuxis or Apelles. The frescoes that have been preserved at Herculaneum and Pompeii represent only a very late period of Græco-Roman art; and while they are sufficient to give us some idea of the style of painting that existed under the Roman Empire, they can do little more than enhance our regret for the loss of the genuine productions of the earlier masters. The vases, on the contrary, are undoubtedly the works of artists contemporary with the most celebrated of those painters—of men who had studied the frescoes of Polygnotus as well as the bas-reliefs of Phidias—and who were as familiar with the pictures of Zeuxis and Apelles as with the statues of Praxiteles or Lysippus.

We must not, indeed, be led away by this circumstance to entertain an exaggerated opinion of the actual merit of the vase-paintings themselves. There is no doubt that these are far removed from the masterpieces to which we have alluded: they were the productions of an inferior class of artists, in all probability specially devoted to this work; and the fact that no allusion to them is found in any of the ancient writers who have touched upon the history of the fine arts is alone sufficient to show that they were altogether regarded as works of a subordinate order. Millingen has justly observed that they may be considered as standing to the works of the great artists of antiquity in the relation of prints of indifferent execution to the pictures from which they were taken.* Perhaps a still closer analogy might be found in the paintings on the ordinary

* Millingen, *Ancient Unedited Monuments*, p. ii.

majolica ware of the 16th century as compared with the original works of Raffaello. But just as these *majolica* plates—were they the only surviving monuments of the period—would enable us to form a conception—imperfect, indeed, and inadequate enough, but still far more just and true than we could obtain from any other quarter—of the school of art from which they were derived, so do the paintings on the glazed earthen vases of the best ages of Greece afford us an invaluable assistance in appreciating the style of art of which they are unfortunately become the only representatives.

Interesting as are the Greek vases to the student of ancient art on this account alone, they are even more so to the classical scholar from their intimate connexion with that vast field of mythological lore and poetical legend that forms the groundwork of all Greek art as well as of Greek poetry. The same inexhaustible stores of poetical myths that were present to the minds of the Attic tragedians, and that are poured forth by Pindar with a profusion that would seem to savour of pedantry were it not for the recollection that these beautiful fictions were still living truths to his hearers—were equally familiar to the artists of every class, and have furnished the subjects of countless multitudes of those painted vases that have been preserved by a singular good fortune down to our own time. It becomes the task of the *literati* of the present day to illustrate these curious relics by the assistance of all the learning that the pedantry of Alexandrian writers, and the diligence of later grammarians have preserved to us. But the two modes of illustration will be found to react upon each other; and it is often interesting to observe how some obscure allusion is explained, or some half-forgotten myth starts suddenly into fresh life and reality by our finding it depicted on a vase which may have adorned the sideboard of Æschylus or Pindar.

It is scarcely necessary at the present day—we hope not, at least—to enter afresh into the old controversy whether these painted Greek vases are really *Greek* at all. Not many years ago, indeed, the idea of their Etruscan origin was, we believe, generally prevalent in this country; and we thought it necessary on a former occasion to combat it at some length. But this notion—which proceeded originally from an entire ignorance of the history of ancient art, combined with the mistaken patriotism of some Tuscan *literati*, and the belief that the stiff and quaint conventional figures of the earlier vases could not have proceeded from Greek artists—though it for a time appeared to derive a strong confirmation from the remarkable discoveries at Vulci already alluded to, has gradually given way

before the progress of critical inquiry. We observe with satisfaction that Mr. Birch has adopted without question the view which has long been general among continental antiquarians and scholars, and treats the whole of these painted vases, including those found at Vulci and elsewhere in Etruria, as well as those exhumed in Campania or Sicily, as undoubted productions of Greek art.

But assuming this question to be fairly set at rest—on this side of the Alps, at all events, for we doubt whether all the Italian antiquarians have yet given up the claims of their countrymen—there still remains another question, of less vital importance to the history of ancient art, but still very strongly connected with it, as to the place where and the people by whom these vases were actually manufactured. Are we to suppose that they are the productions of some central fabric or school of design, from whence they were dispersed over the different localities at which we have discovered them; in the same manner as our Staffordshire potteries supply cups and plates to distant parts of the world, or as Dresden china may figure on the dining-tables of Belgravia? or is it probable that the vases themselves were manufactured by Greek artists in different localities, and that there were potteries in Etruria and in Campania, in Apulia and Sicily, as well as at Athens and Corinth, at all which places the same glazed and painted vases of the peculiar description were produced, with which we are so familiar? On this point the opinions of the most learned archaeologists are still divided; and the mere weight of authority cannot be looked upon as decisive on the one side or the other. The former theory has been supported by Professor Gerhard, whose invaluable 'Report' upon the vases discovered at Vulci may be considered as, to a great degree, the foundation of all subsequent researches; and has been since maintained by the high authority of Welcker, as well as by M. Lenormant in France; while the contrary view has been urged with equal learning and ability by Kramer, by Thiersch, and by Otto Jahn. On this point, as on most others, Mr. Birch does not venture to express any decided opinion, though we think we discern some indications of his leaning to what may be called the *importation* theory.

The question is one that must be decided by internal evidence; for external authority is almost wholly wanting. It is, indeed, so intimately mixed up with the consideration of the vases themselves as works of art, that it is impossible to separate the one from the other. Hence we shall endeavour, before attempting to pronounce any opinion upon this controverted point, to present our readers with a brief review of the leading

characteristics of the vases in question, of the different classes into which they may be divided, and the several stages in the progress of the art that these classes serve to indicate.

The earliest vases that can be considered as constituting a style apart—for the most ancient of all are of so rude and simple a character that they can scarcely be regarded as more than the first attempts of the primitive Greeks, before they had conceived the notion of converting their pottery into a vehicle for artistic ideas—are those which have been variously termed Egyptian, Phœnician, Phœnicio-Babylonian, Corinthian, or Doric. They are characterised alike by imperfection of execution, and by a conventional stiffness of design, which at once suggests the idea of its being derived from an oriental source, though the vases themselves are unquestionably Greek. Their forms are heavy and inelegant; the ground is a dull yellow, or pale ash colour, which is probably only the natural colour of the clay; and the figures and patterns are painted upon it in colours which, though somewhat more varied than those of the later vases—including black or rather a blackish brown, a brownish crimson or purple, and white—are all alike dull and opaque, and almost wholly destitute of that lustrous brilliancy which distinguishes the vases of the better periods. The ornaments are arranged in bands running round the vase, and have generally a strong oriental character, both in the patterns themselves, in which the Egyptian lotus is conspicuous; and still more in the rows of animals—including lions, leopards, bulls, goats, swans, &c., intermixed with sphinxes, griffins, chimæras, and other creatures of Eastern imagination—which follow one another in monotonous and often repeated series.

The celebrated vase found by Mr. Dodwell in a tomb near Corinth, and hence commonly known as the Dodwell Vase, may be taken as a characteristic specimen of this style. But this very instance may serve to exemplify the fact, so important to observe, that even at this early period Greek art was beginning to emancipate itself from its oriental trammels, and had entered upon its career of progress. For while the body of the vase itself, in this case as in many others, exhibits nothing but grotesque figures of animals, together with the customary floral ornaments filling up all the vacant spaces, the cover of it, which was found with it, and unquestionably belongs to the same period, presents us with numerous human figures engaged in attacking a wild boar; and what is still more interesting, the names, written in very ancient characters, by the side of the warriors, prove that this hunting-piece is no other than our old

friend the chase of the Calydonian boar; and enable us to recognise, among the heroes engaged, the well-known names of Thersander and Agamemnon.

This custom of writing the names of the persons represented on pictures, bas-reliefs, and other works of art which admitted of it, was common among the early Greeks, as we learn, among other instances, from the well-known description of the chest of Cypselus, by Pausanias, on which the subjects were uniformly thus indicated, the names being written (precisely as we find them on the earlier vases) in archaic characters, sometimes in a straight line, sometimes backwards and forwards (*boustrophedon*), and at others in irregular windings, which made it difficult to follow them.* The same custom is found also in the curious fragment of a bas-relief from Samothrace, now in the Louvre, which is justly accounted by Millingen one of the earliest extant specimens of Greek sculpture†, and presents, in the style of its execution, a marked similarity with the figures on the Dodwell Vase.

Several other specimens may be pointed out which exhibit all the leading peculiarities of this style, but on which one of the various bands or friezes that adorn them, instead of animals or monsters, presents us with human figures engaged in action, and in all such cases there is little doubt that these are intended to represent some heroic myth or legend; not any mere scene from ordinary life. Gradually the portions thus appropriated began to extend, and predominate over the animals and flowers, till the sphinxes and lions were thrust into a corner, or disappeared altogether, and the pictures of heroic life became the main ornament of the vase.

The way was thus prepared for the second style, one of the most important and interesting of all. In this the figures are uniformly painted black upon a red ground, with the addition in some cases of white, especially to mark the female complexion; the drawing is still hard and stiff, and of a conventional character; yet, the figures are full of life and animation, carried indeed not unfrequently to excess; the story is well and clearly told; and there is in the best specimens of this style a vigour and boldness of conception, with a clearness of outline, and distinctness of character that remind one strongly of the Æginetan marbles. At the same time, it is impossible not to remark that the greater part of the vases of this period present a degree of stiffness and exaggeration, at times amounting almost to ca-

* Pausan. v. 17. § 6.

† Millingen's *Ancient unedited Monuments*, part ii. pl. 1.

ricature, which is the natural result of a conventional mannerism that had fallen into the hands of inferior artists. The subjects are for the most part taken from the earlier mythological legends, among which the exploits of Hercules are repeated on countless vases of different shapes and sizes. But here, again, we observe one leading characteristic of the Greek genius. Notwithstanding the apparent conventionality of style, and general similarity of treatment, often as the same subject is repeated, it is never represented in *exactly* the same manner. We do not believe that there can be found in all the museums of Europe any two vases with historical subjects of which the one is a mere copy of the other. Even the Panathenaic vases, which from their peculiar character and destination admitted of little variety, are never precise copies. Every specimen has some distinguishing characteristic, which gives it an individuality of its own. It would seem as if the repetition of mechanical copies was wholly alien to the spirit of Greek art. Nor is there the least foundation for supposing that any of the existing paintings on vases are actual copies of the masterpieces of the great contemporary artists. There is no doubt that they are close imitations, but the variety observable in all works of this class excludes the idea of their being more than imitations.

As it is on vases of this style that mythological subjects are the most abundant, it is fortunate for us that the artists had not yet discarded the custom of writing the names of the heroes whom they wished to represent. So long indeed as they still retained too much of the formal stiffness of early art, to give much individual character or expression to the countenances, it was natural that this custom should still continue in use; and we know that even Polygnotus did not disdain to add the names of the persons represented in his frescoes at Delphi.* By this means we are enabled in many cases to determine with certainty the precise subject represented, and the marked similarity of treatment which pervades all the works of this period, enables us readily to recognise the same subject on other vases, where the names are wanting. In some cases, indeed, the artists were not content with writing the names of the heroes engaged, or personages present, but added some descriptive epithet, as *Πρίαμος ὁ πολὺς*, 'the hoary Priam;' *ἄλιος γέρον*, 'the old man of the sea,' applied to Nereus, &c. We even find them affixing the names of inanimate objects: such as *βωμός*, 'an altar;' *λύρα*, 'a lyre;' *ὕδρια*, 'a water-jug;' and in some instances still

* Pausan. x. 25.

more precisely, Σφινξ ἦδε, 'this is a sphinx.' Again, in other instances, though much more rarely, words are painted on the vases which are supposed to proceed from the mouth of the figure represented, after the fashion that we see frequently in old engravings. One of the most curious cases of this kind is that in which Ajax and Achilles are represented as playing at dice — a game, it may be remembered, which was supposed to have been invented by Palamedes, to beguile the time during the wearisome hours of the siege of Troy — and the one hero cries out, τρία, 'Three!' the other, τέσσαρα, 'Four!' as they make their respective throws. In another instance we are presented with a complete dialogue between two youths and an old man, the one of whom points to a flying swallow, with the remark: ἴδου χελιδών, 'See! there's a swallow;' another answers, νῆ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, 'Yes, by Hercules;' and a third adds, ἔαρ ἦδε, 'the spring is come.'

The frequent addition of these names and words is not only of use to us in discovering the subjects represented on the vases, but it affords us a valuable assistance in determining the period at which they were made, and the people with whom they originated. It is obvious, on the first glance, that they prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the vases on which they are found were the works of Greek artists, and that they were made (in the first instance at least) for a people who understood the Greek language. But we may go a step further. The inscriptions on the earliest class of vases already described, are not only Greek, but they are *Doric* Greek; the alphabet in which they are written is the same as is found in the earliest *Doric* inscriptions now extant, and which differs materially from that of inscriptions in the *Ionian* and *Attic* dialects of the same period. The names themselves also sometimes assume a pure *Doric* form, but as the inscriptions on the vases of this most ancient style are almost confined to proper names, in which dialectic peculiarities are not so easily observed, their evidence in this respect is scarcely conclusive. On the other hand, the much more numerous inscriptions on the vases of the second style are as unquestionably *Attic*, and are written in the alphabet usual in *Attic* inscriptions of the fifth century before the Christian era.

Now there are strong reasons for supposing the earliest vases to be of *Corinthian* origin. It is not merely that Mr. Dodwell's famous vase, which has been taken as a sort of type of the class, was found at Corinth, and that all the other specimens of any importance that have been discovered on that site are in the same style; but there is good reason to believe that these are

only the scanty remnants of a much more numerous deposit. The great *trouvaille* was made in the time of Julius Cæsar, when the number of painted vases discovered in the tombs at Corinth created as great a sensation among the Roman *dilettanti* as those of Vulci have done in our own day.* All that remain to us, therefore, are a few scanty gleanings after the regular harvest has been gathered in, and it is in accordance with this that the finer specimens discovered at Corinth have been found in sepulchres at an unusual depth. It is important to add that the Corinthians were celebrated in ancient times for their pottery; they even disputed with the Athenians the claim to be the inventors of the potter's wheel†—a sufficient proof that their cultivation of the art could be traced back to a very early period. Nor must it be forgotten that the extensive commerce of Corinth, unquestionably the first trading city of Greece during the early period to which these vases belong, would render it easy to export them to even distant lands.

But whatever may have been the celebrity of Corinth for its manufactures of earthenware, it was certainly surpassed by that of Athens, which possessed in the days of Socrates and Aristophanes an unquestioned superiority in this department.‡ The extensive quarter of the city called the Ceramicus (*κεραμεικός*), was named from the potteries established there; and we have the distinct testimony of ancient writers that Athenian pottery was an important article of export, and was not only to be found in all parts of Greece, but was even carried by traders as far as the island of Cerne, on the west coast of Africa.§ It is true that the productions here especially referred to are apparently earthenware vessels of a more substantial and useful description, well adapted for household purposes||; but it would be natural to suppose that a city so celebrated for its potteries would excel also in the finer and more ornamental kinds of ware. The peculiar excellence of the clay found at Colias in Attica¶, and exclusively employed by the Athenian potters, would be more essential for this than for the coarser branches of manufacture. And of the very few allusions to painted vases which we find in ancient authors, it is remarkable that two of the most

* Strabo, viii. p. 381.

† Theophrast. ap. Schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* xiii. 27.

‡ See the passage of Critias,—the pupil of Socrates, and famous, or rather infamous, as one of the Thirty Tyrants,—cited by Athenæus, i. p. 28. b.

§ Scylax, p. 54.

|| *κλεινότερον κέραμον χρησιμον οικονόμον*, as Critias calls it.

¶ Suidas, s. v.

distinct—which occur in Pindar and Aristophanes—refer clearly in both cases to vases of Athenian manufacture.

Hence, we cannot be surprised that the indications derived from inscriptions on the vases of the second style—a style which was an immense step in advance of the preceding one—should all point to an Athenian origin; and that the city which for so long a time stood pre-eminent above all others in the highest branches of the fine arts, should have maintained an equal superiority in this subordinate department.

While, therefore, we think the arguments in favour of the Doric, and probably the Corinthian, origin of the earlier style all but conclusive, there appears to us as little reason to doubt that Athens was the parent of the second 'or 'old' style, as Mr. Birch has termed it; and that a great proportion of the vases of this epoch actually proceeded from the potteries of the Ceramicus. We shall recur hereafter to some special arguments which add strong confirmation to this view.

Very much the same evidence may be adduced, though perhaps to a less conclusive extent, in support of the Athenian origin of the style that came next in the progress of the art. This is most readily distinguished from the one which preceded it by a marked change in the mechanical process of execution. While during the former period the figures were always painted black upon a red ground, the artist now had recourse to a directly opposite process, and left the ground black, while the figures and accessories were painted in red. This change was an undoubted advantage in an artistic point of view. It enabled the painter to trace all the inner markings of details,—such as the hair and eyes, the folds of the drapery and outlines of the muscular form, which in the former style had been produced by incised lines scratched through the black surface with a graving tool,—in lines of colour, which could be drawn with much greater facility; at the same time that the appearance of the figures as light portions upon a dark ground, gave a character of relief to the whole composition. It was indeed a necessary step in the progress of the art towards that perfection of which it was susceptible; and we cannot, therefore, be surprised to find that it gradually prevailed over the old method, which it in the end wholly superseded. But it must not be supposed that the change was sudden and complete, or that a vase with black figures is necessarily older than one with red. There is no doubt that the two methods continued for a time to be practised side by side; we find the same artists producing vases in both styles, and what is still more conclusive, there are some—though rare—instances in which both modes of painting are found on one and the same vase.

There was doubtless much of *fashion* in this matter, as in most others. But, moreover, the change of which we are now speaking was coincident with many others which pervaded not only the whole field of the fine arts, but the whole fabric of Greek society. It was a part of the same movement of that general breaking-up of old traditions, and introduction of new ideas, that is so strongly depicted in the plays of Aristophanes; and we cannot doubt that the men of the old school would cling to the old fashion in this as in more important questions; they would identify the increasing freedom of design with the increasing freedom of manners, which to them was synonymous with licence of morals. The quaint and archaic forms, and the exaggerated attitudes of the older vases, had become identified in their minds with their notions of heroes and demi-gods; and if the young men of the rising generation might point with a smile to what they considered antiquated caricatures, their more conservative elders would answer triumphantly that *this too* was a part of 'the education that had trained up the men who fought at Marathon.'

But a complete change of style in other respects was far from being the immediate result of this change in the mode of execution. The first vases with red figures still exhibit marked features of resemblance to those with black figures, both in the style of drawing and in the composition and mode of treatment. Though the alteration in the mechanical process had undoubtedly prepared the way for the free development of the art, it was some time before the painters who adopted it could emancipate themselves from the trammels of conventional ideas and traditional habits. Hence, we find that the vases with red figures may be subdivided into two classes, which have been called the 'strong style' and the 'fine style;' the first still retaining the distinct impress of the archaic character; the latter altogether free from its influence, and presenting all the characteristics of the best period of Greek art. These two classes of vases have been treated separately by Mr. Birch, following the example of Kramer and other German archæologists. But we are doubtful

*

ἀλλ' οὖν ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκείνα,

Ἐξ ὧν ἄνδρας Μαραθωνομάχους ἢ μὴ παίδευσις ἔθρεψεν.

. ARISTOPHANES, *Nubes*, 986.

The contest between Æschylus and Euripides in the *Frogs* of the same author is a counterpart of the dialogue between the Δίκαιος and Ἀδίκος λόγος in the play referred to; and it would require little imagination to transfer the field of a similar discussion to the arts of painting and sculpture.

how far it is convenient to separate the two. The distinction between them is one more easily felt than expressed in words, and cannot fail to strike the intelligent observer in the more characteristic specimens of each class. But, as might be expected from the nature of the case, the transition from the one to the other is so gradual, the two styles pass into one another by so many intermediate gradations; the inferior specimens of the best period still resemble so closely those of the preceding epoch, that it is difficult, in the absence of any external criterion, to draw the line between the two with sufficient accuracy to become the basis of satisfactory classification.

There is indeed one circumstance which to a certain extent supplies such a criterion, and at all events has an important bearing on the question of the age of these vases, and consequently on the chronology of Greek art. It is a fact well known to all scholars that the long vowels (Η Ω), as well as the double consonants (Ψ and Ξ), were not introduced into the Greek alphabet till a late period, and were first adopted by the Athenians in their public acts and inscriptions in the archonship of Euclid, B.C. 403.* Hence we may unhesitatingly pronounce an Athenian inscription in which these letters are found to be subsequent to the above date, or, in other words, to be later than the close of the Peloponnesian war. Now, it is certainly true as a general rule, that these letters are found on the vases of the best and finest style of art, and that they do not occur on those of the earlier or 'strong' style, any more than on those of the older style with black figures. We must be careful, indeed, not to strain this inference too far. We do not know that a change of such importance would be adopted by all private individuals as soon as it was introduced into public documents, and it is clear that every painter or manufacturer of vases was at liberty to employ the new alphabet or the old one at his pleasure. On the other hand, the new letters were undoubtedly known at Athens some time before they were adopted by the state, and may therefore have very probably been introduced in the in-

* It is one of those unfortunate chronological errors which so frequently disfigure the work of Mr. Birch, that he has given this well-known date—one of the most important, as well as one of the most familiar, in the whole history of Greek archaeology,—as the *seventy-fourth* Olympiad, B. C. 484, instead of the *ninety-fourth*, B.C. 404, thus throwing it just eighty years too far back: and this in a passage (vol. i. p. 224.) where he is pointing out the 'critical marks for determining the ages of vases,' and where such an error is therefore peculiarly liable to produce confusion. Yet he has himself elsewhere (ib. p. 285.) given it correctly.

scriptions on vases at an earlier period; and it would even appear from a remarkable passage of Euripides, that they were already in familiar use at least twenty years before the archonship of Euclid.* But, after making due allowance for anomalies and exceptions arising from these causes,—and such are undoubtedly found—we may still assume as a general rule, that all the finest vases of the best style, with red figures, may be referred to the fourth century before Christ,* or to a period extending from the end of the Peloponnesian war to about the time of Alexander the Great.

This conclusion is entirely in accordance with all that we know from other sources of the history of Greek art. The vases in the *strong* style, which, with some remains of the old stiffness, are yet full of beauty and character, and have a quiet simple grandeur that is especially characteristic of all the earlier Greek works, would be thus referred to the period of the Peloponnesian war, and to that immediately preceding it—the age of Polygnotus and Phidias; while the more free and flowing outlines, and the easy natural forms of the vases of the fine style, would belong to the generations that elapsed from the time of Parrhasius to that of Apelles—unquestionably the period when the art of painting had attained to its highest excellence in Greece.

The indications of an Athenian origin appear not less clearly on the vases with red figures of the strong style, than on those which had immediately preceded them: the names of the personages represented, as well as those of the artists who manufactured or painted the vases, are still frequently inscribed on them, and these inscriptions are still as uniformly in the Attic dialect. But as the art improved, the custom of writing the names seems to have gradually dropped out of use; even those of the artists are found less frequently than before, and we consequently lose, in the case of the best and finest vases, one important auxiliary in determining the place of their production. There is, at the same time, a marked, though gradual change, in the general character of the subjects represented: mythological scenes and stories from the ancient legends become less frequent; battle-pieces especially cease to be the predominant favourites; while numerous vases present us with scenes of domestic life, and even where the subject is still of a tradi-

* See the fragment from the *Theseus* of Euripides, in which the name of the hero is *described* as it would be written in the later or modern alphabet, ΘΗΣΕΥΣ. The play from which this passage is taken must have been exhibited, according to Clinton, *before* B.C. 422.

tionary character, we often find the softer and more domestic scenes from the heroic legends taking the place of the labours of Hercules, or the combats of Achilles.

But the art of painting did not long remain at the high point of excellence to which it had attained under Apelles; and we find in the vases also a rapid transition from the finest and purest style, to one in which freedom had degenerated into licence, and facility had become carelessness. The addition of meretricious ornaments, and a neglect of harmony in the composition, are among the earliest symptoms of the debasement of the art. Yet the finer and earlier specimens of this style, which may be considered as marking the fourth stage in the progress, or rather in the history, of the art—for it had now ceased to be progress in the true sense of the word—are still very striking, perhaps to a superficial observer the most remarkable of all. The vases themselves are frequently of large size, and their forms still graceful and handsome, though in this respect, also, the eye of the practised connoisseur will observe a falling-off from the exquisite purity of the preceding style. They are loaded, indeed *overloaded*, with ornaments, and contain numerous figures, occupying in general the whole field of the vase, over which they are scattered, without regard to that symmetry so carefully observed in the compositions of the best period. The figures themselves are often careless and incorrect in drawing, but are at the same time executed with a freedom that shows the artist to have wholly overcome the difficulties which had embarrassed the earliest painters; and in a few instances the execution is worthy of an earlier and better period. The celebrated vase of Meidias, in the British Museum, is one of the most perfect specimens of this style in its earliest phase; it may be considered, indeed, as standing on the very verge of the two styles, though with all its beauty we cannot fail to recognise in it the first step in the degeneracy of art.

The greater part of the vases which belong to this period are, however, far inferior to the beautiful specimen we have just noticed: the downhill progress was rapid, and the distinction which Mr. Birch has attempted to draw between the 'florid style' and that of the decline—or, as he chooses to call it, for no reason that we can perceive, save that of preferring a French word to an English one, 'the decadence'—appears to us one that is difficult to maintain, and can serve but little purpose. The vases of the fourth period generally are characterised by some external signs which assist us in recognising them even at the first glance. The red colour is paler, often, indeed, merely a reddish yellow, which was perhaps thought to present a

resemblance to the colour of flesh; and the black of the ground is less vivid, sometimes passing into a dark leaden grey, and the glaze is less perfect. It seems evident, indeed, that the skill of the manufacturer had fallen off in at least as great a degree as that of the artist and designer. This last circumstance may serve in some measure to explain the rapidity of that decline which we trace upon the vases in question; a decline certainly both more speedy and more complete than we find in any contemporary branch of the fine arts. If we compare the beautiful coins of Pyrrhus, or the exquisite bronzes of Syria, with the vases of the fourth style, we shall find it difficult to believe that they are to be assigned to the same people and the same period. But there seems good reason to suppose, that the decline in the art of painting on vases was accelerated by its having fallen into the hands of an inferior class of workmen. The vast increase in the abundance of the precious metals in Europe, arising from the conquests of Alexander, had introduced the extensive use of gold and silver. The rich and luxurious would no longer content themselves with vases of earthenware, however ornamental; and the art of painting and decorating these sank into insignificance, while the artists who might otherwise have sought reputation in this kind of work, betook themselves to the production of embossed works in gold and silver, which were more in request, and which they perhaps erroneously imagined would prove more durable.

But not only did the production of painted vases fall thus rapidly into an inferior and subordinate position, they soon ceased to be made at all. Singular as it may at first sight appear, it is a clearly ascertained fact, that the art of making them was eventually wholly lost. They had certainly ceased to be manufactured long before the close of the Roman republic; and in the days of Cæsar, we know that when some of them were accidentally discovered in the tombs of Capua and Corinth, they were as eagerly sought for by the lovers of *virtù* among the Romans of that day, as those of Nola or Vulci have been in our own time. Not a single Greek vase has been discovered in the excavations at Herculaneum or Pompeii—a fact that clearly proves them to have been equally unknown under the Roman empire.

By far the largest proportion of the vases of the latest style have been discovered in Apulia, or in the province now called the *Basilicata*; hence they are generally considered as forming a class entirely apart from the preceding ones; and their inferior execution is ascribed to their being the productions of a local and provincial fabric. Yet it is certain that, notwithstanding

the characteristic differences already noticed, there are many points of connexion between them and the purer specimens that had preceded them. Nor is even the local separation of the two styles by any means as complete as it is sometimes supposed to be. The greatest number of the vases of the finest style has been undoubtedly found at Nola, which, in this respect, stands unrivalled among the cities of Campania; but those of a locality not far distant from thence, Sta Agata dei Goti, are of a very inferior style, and display unequivocal signs of the same degeneracy of art which we find still more strongly marked in the vases of Apulia. Again, of those discovered in this last district, there are many various gradations to be observed: several of those found at Ruvo especially, are equal to the greater part of those from Campania; and the best specimens discovered on this site (such as the beautiful vase, with a battle of the Amazons, in the Neapolitan Museum), display so marked a resemblance in the style of treatment and character of design to the vases of the best period, that it is impossible not to conceive them to have originally proceeded from the same school. On the other hand, the vases found in the Basilicata are the poorest of all, and exhibit the defects common to the whole of this later style, in their extremest form, and lowest state of degradation.

To sum up in a few words the conclusions that may be fairly deduced from this brief review of the progress and development of the art, as evinced by the vases themselves, it appears that there are strong reasons for assigning the vases of the first and oldest style to a Doric origin; that those of the second style are as decidedly Attic; and that the same may be asserted with confidence of the earlier vases of the third class (those in what has been called by Mr. Birch the 'strong' style), while the evidence is less clear and decisive in regard to the later vases of the same style, or those of the finest period; but that these are still so intimately connected with those that immediately preceded them, as to render it difficult, if not impossible, to separate them. Lastly, those of the fourth class, notwithstanding many obvious points of connexion, present differences of style and execution, such as to render it not improbable that they may be referred to a different, and probably a local, origin.

With the exception of this last class of vases, it is certain that no one style can be looked upon as peculiar to any one region or district, still less as confined to any one locality. Vases in the oldest or Doric style have been found not only at Corinth, and in other parts of Greece, but at Nola, Capua, and Vulci. Those of the old Attic style, with black figures on a red ground, have been discovered in great numbers at many different places

in the south of Italy, as well as in Sicily, while they are especially numerous at Vulci, where they may be considered as the predominating class. The same rich locality has, however, yielded great numbers of vases of the 'strong' style, which likewise abound in Sicily, so much so indeed that these were at one time considered to be characteristic of that island. They are found also, though more sparingly, at Nola and in its neighbourhood; which, on the other hand (as we have already mentioned), is the place that has produced the greatest proportion of vases of the finest style, and the best period. It was, indeed, for a long time considered as the undoubted centre of their manufacture, and it has even been supposed that the greater part of the vases discovered in Etruria had proceeded from the potteries of Nola. But specimens that may vie, in perfection of style, with the choicest productions of the excavations at Nola, have been found also at Vulci, at Ruvo, at Tarentum, at Girgenti in Sicily, and at Athens itself. It must be added, that while the number of vases found in Greece proper is still very inferior to those of Italy, that number is continually increasing with the progress of excavations; and recent researches in the island of Ægina alone have brought to light specimens of all the different styles of art from the earliest to the latest.* Painted vases have also been found in considerable numbers at Kertch—the ancient Panticapæum†; and at Berehice, in the Cyrenaica—two of the extreme limits of Greek colonisation.

The inference that appears to us to result beyond dispute from the above comparison is, that the painted vases were, to a considerable extent, objects of traffic and of export from one country to another. They were, in fact, the ornamental china of the ancient world; and just as the *boudoir* of a modern lady of fashion may contain green dragons from Japan, as well as cups of the choicest old Dresden and Sèvres, intermingled with the most recent productions of Worcester and Coalbrook Dale, so do we find in the sepulchres of Vulci—where the contents of the lady's *boudoir*, and the ornaments of her husband's side-board, lie buried with them—the relics of different ages, and the productions of different fabrics. Old vases from Corinth,

* Thiersch, *Die Hellenische bemalten Vasen*, p. 83.

† Dr. Macpherson's '*Antiquities of Kertch*,' published in 1857, contain, in a very elegant form, the results of his researches and explorations in the Cimmerian Bosphorus during the British occupation; and the British Museum is indebted to the same gentleman for some of the most curious of the remains which were discovered and preserved by his care.

with quaint grotesque looking sphinxes and strange birds, that it would puzzle an ornithologist to classify, may have been as much in request with old ladies or vase-fanciers in those days, as were the great Chinese dragons with our grandmothers. It is certain that the greater part of the vases now remaining were never meant for use, and could only have been designed as ornamental works.* Their great fragility, resulting from the extreme thinness of the clay, as well as the imperfect character of the internal glaze, which is seldom thoroughly impervious to fluids, renders it clear that they could never have been intended for ordinary household purposes. It is true that they affected the same forms as those of the ordinary utensils of the day, and we see the *hydria*, or water-jar, the *amphora*, that served to hold wine or oil; the *crater*, or bowl in which the wine and water was mixed; and the *cyliz*, or cup in which it was drunk, represented upon ancient works of art, of precisely the same shapes as those which we find in the sepulchres. . But this is no more than occurs in the parallel case of modern porcelain.

In many cases the purpose for which the individual vase was designed is clearly indicated; a large proportion of them were intended as prizes for games and athletic contests, others as wedding presents; while certain classes were undoubtedly made for the express purpose to which we find them applied, — to be buried in the grave with their owner. The manufacture of this last class was a special business at Athens, and a saucy young man in one of the comedies of Aristophanes, consigns his antiquated mistress to the tender attentions of ‘that best of artists, ‘who paints the vases for the dead.’* The *lecythi* here mentioned, — tall slender vases, with a narrow neck and a single handle, — are precisely that description of vessels that are shown by the subjects represented on them, as well as by the manner in which they are introduced in the paintings themselves, to have been appropriated to funereal purposes.† But these are nearly confined to Attica and Sicily; the vessels found in the graves at Vulci or Nola were evidently of a different description; they had been the property, in his lifetime, of the individual whom they accompanied in his last home, and were doubtless buried with him only because they had been valued by him when alive.

We have already adverted to the fact that the makers’ names

N. τὸν τῶν γραφῶν ἀριστον. Gr. οὗτος δ’ ἔστι τις;

N. ὃς τοῖς νεκροῖσι ζωγράφει τὰς ληκύθους.

ARISTOPH. *Ecclesiaz.* 995.

† See the one figured by Mr. Birch in vol. ii. p. 124., which is, however, of much later date than those referred to by Aristophanes.

are frequently inscribed upon the vases themselves. In some instances both that of the maker and the painter are added, and we thus learn that not only the artists who adorned the vases, but the potters who manufactured them, were alike of pure Greek origin. These names are as unequivocally Greek on the vases found at Vulci and Nola—neither of which was a Greek city—as on those of Locri or Agrigentum. But, what is still more important, the names thus inscribed furnish a direct evidence that some at least of the vases found in different localities had been imported from a distance; for in several instances we find the name of the same maker on specimens actually found in distant regions. Thus the name of Nicosthenes, already known from vases in Sicily, has been repeatedly found on those exhumed at Vulci; and the artist Ergotimus, who has affixed his name to a cup with black figures, in the old style, found at Ægina, reappears as the maker of the celebrated François vase, one of the most remarkable of those that have been discovered in Etruria.

Perhaps a still more curious proof of the original connexion that must have subsisted between the different places where the productions of the Greek potteries are now discovered, is to be found in the instance of the Panathenaic vases. The first of these was discovered by Mr. Burgon at Athens, in 1813, and is now in the British Museum. It is a large *amphora*, with black figures, of very early and archaic style, having on the one side a representation of a young man in a chariot with two horses, and on the other Minerva herself, the tutelary goddess of the city and the presiding deity of the games. As we know from Pindar that the prize at the Panathenaic games was a portion of oil from certain sacred olive-trees, which was presented to the victorious candidate in a *painted earthen vase**, we might perhaps have arrived at the conclusion, without any extraordinary amount of antiquarian sagacity, that the vase in question was one of those presented on such an occasion to the victor. But all doubt on the subject is removed by the inscription annexed to it, which says in distinct, though archaic characters, 'I am a prize from Athens.'†

At the time of its discovery, this singular monument stood quite alone, and attracted, as well it might, great interest and

Pind. *Nem.* x. 65–69. 'He brought (to Argos) the fruit of 'the olive in earth burnt by fire, in the variegated receptacles of 'vases.'

† *Τῶν Ἀθήνηθεν ἁθλῶν εἰμί.* That this is the correct reading of the inscription is now proved beyond a doubt, since the discovery of the vases at Ben Ghazi.

attention among antiquarians. But in 1824 a similar vase—similar both in subject and design, though of rather less antiquated character, *and with the same inscription*—was brought to light at Nola; while a few years later the excavations at Vulci produced not less than twenty or thirty of these Panathenaic vases. Two or three have been since found at Ruvo, and very recently several at Ben Ghazi (Berenice), on the coast of Africa. These last are however in some respects different from any previously discovered; they are obviously—to judge from the style of their execution—of a much later period, and this conclusion is confirmed by the curious fact that they bear the names of the archons at Athens under whom they were made, and can thus be assigned with certainty to the time of Alexander the Great. This last discovery is undoubtedly one of the greatest interest, and adds a strong confirmation to the supposition that these vases, wherever they are found, actually proceed from Athens; for the names of the Athenian magistrates render this almost certain in the case of the African vases; and it may fairly be asked why, if we find five or six such vases at a remote spot in Africa, which has as yet been but little explored, we should not find them in still greater numbers among the thousands that have been exhumed at Vulci? But whether the different Panathenaic vases be admitted or not to be all of genuine Athenian manufacture, they incontestably prove a close connexion with Athens. The continued and systematic imitation of an Athenian prototype—a model, too, which had but little beauty or artistic interest to recommend it—serves to establish beyond a doubt the strong and pervading operation of Athenian influence upon the art of vase-painting in all parts where it was practised.

One other instance of this same connexion is worthy of mention; and here again it is with Vulci, the most remote of all the places that have been generally supposed to be the seats of manufacture, and the one that would seem, as far as historical evidence goes, the least likely to have received influence from Athens, that the connexion is the most clearly evinced. A whole class of vases have been found there of the form of the *hydria* or water-jar, and adorned with figures in the black archaic style, representing scenes at a fountain, from which females are drawing water. Such a representation on a water-jar might seem simple enough, and to require no further explanation, but several small circumstances had led to the suggestion that all these paintings were in fact representations of the same scene; and Karl Otfried Müller early made the ingenious conjecture that they were *wedding vases*, and that the fountain was no other than the sacred spring of Callirrhoë, from which it

had been the custom at Athens from time immemorial to fetch water for the bride on her nuptial morning.* This conjecture was converted into certainty by the finding on one of the vases of this class the inscription KAAAIPE KPENE — the fountain of Callirrhœ.

The combination of these circumstances proves, we think, beyond all doubt, that the vases found at Vulci in Etruria proceeded in some manner or another from Athens; and the only question that can reasonably be raised is whether the vases themselves were actually brought from the potteries of the Ceramicus, or manufactures of a similar kind had been established in that remote region by Athenian workmen, who brought with them the secret of their art, as well as their skill in design, their language, and their mythology. In one word, are we to suppose that the makers were imported, or their productions? Of the two alternatives thus presented to us, we certainly think that the former is attended with the greatest difficulties. The hypothesis that it was the potters who were imported† would, perhaps, be tenable enough, if it could be limited to a single locality or a single period. But we find at Vulci alone, as already pointed out, specimens of all the different styles of vase-painting, and of all the successive stages of its development. Can we suppose that the art went on thus gradually developing itself on a foreign soil, and surrounded by foreign influences, yet still retained its original Hellenic, and even Attic character, as pure and unmixed as we find it throughout these successive periods? Could successive generations of potters and of artists retain, for a space of several centuries, not only the traditionary secrets of their art, but the purity of taste, the refinement of feeling, the deep impress of the early poetical and mythological traditions of their country, which they may have brought with them in the first instance?

But if this be impossible to believe of any one isolated case, such as that of Vulci, it becomes still more so when we find precisely the same phenomenon repeated several different times in different localities—at Nola, in Sicily, and in Greece itself. We find everywhere the same progress of the art, passing

* Thucyd. ii. 15.

† This is the theory of Professor Gerhard, who maintains that the vases found at Vulci were manufactured *on the spot* by a colony of potters from Athens or from some Athenian colony, who continued to form there a separate *guild* or company. It is hardly necessary to remark that this supposition is wholly unsupported by any historical testimony.

through the same successive phases, labouring under the same difficulties, and emerging to the same freedom and excellence at the same period of its career. The conviction that it was essentially one and the same seems to us irresistible: and startling as it may at first appear, to ascribe the almost countless vases discovered in the graves of Vulci to a direct Athenian origin, it appears to involve in reality far less difficulty than the contrary hypothesis. And if this be admitted in the case of Vulci, it is hard to maintain the contrary view in regard to Nola, a city that was, indeed, much more surrounded by Greek colonies and Greek influences than Vulci, but which was not itself a Greek city, at all events during the period to which alone the vases in question can be referred.* And though the same remark does not apply to Agrigentum or the other Greek colonies in Sicily, yet it appears to us far easier to believe that these opulent and commercial cities should have imported their ornamental pottery from Athens, than that they should have themselves manufactured vases with pure Attic inscriptions, and without any trace of that strong Doric influence which pervaded all their manners and institutions.

The fourth class of vases (as has been already pointed out) is to a great degree exceptional. We trace here, in the most unmistakable manner, precisely those signs of foreign influence which we miss in the other cases; and many circumstances concur to render it probable that these vases were principally, if not wholly, the productions of the part of Italy in which they are actually found. It is true that here, also, there are clear proofs of an original connexion with Greek art; but we find at once that they are the works of a different *school*—of a school formed, indeed, originally upon the traditions of the Attic art which had preceded it, but which departed from these traditions more and more widely as it proceeded. We find unequivocal evidences of foreign manners and foreign influences.

* This point is, we think, clearly established. Whatever value we may attach to the statement that Nola was originally a Chalcidic colony—a fact which rests upon very doubtful authority—it is certain that it had ceased to be Greek long before the fourth century, B.C., which was undoubtedly the period of the production of the beautiful vases preserved in its tombs. The statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that the inhabitants were much attached to the Greeks (σφόδρα τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀσπαζόμενοι), may serve to explain their strong predilection for Greek works of art; but it at the same time proves clearly that they were *not* Greeks. The historian, indeed, expressly contrasts them in this respect with the people of Tarentum and Neapolis, who *were* Greeks.

incorporated in the mythological fables, as well as in the scenes from ordinary life, which are represented on the vases. Even the dress of the figures is often no longer the same. The works of this class may be still called Greek, but it is a debased and mongrel Greek; precisely such as we should expect to find in a district like Apulia, which was thoroughly pervaded by Greek influences, but of which the population was still non-Hellenic.* It is a remarkable confirmation of this, that while the names of the artists are now very rarely found, of the few that are met with, one at least is rather Italian than Greek.

It appears probable, therefore, that the manufacture and production of painted vases fell into a declining condition at Athens not long after the time of Alexander the Great, but that it was taken up by the Greeks of Lower Italy, and the Hellenised inhabitants of Apulia and Lucania, who continued to practise the art, though with continually increasing departure from their prototypes, down to a late period. There are evidences that it was not altogether extinct among them even just before the Social War. In Etruria, also, we find a few instances of attempts to imitate the imported productions of the Greek artists, which betray themselves at once both by the style of their execution, and by the introduction of figures from the Etruscan mythology, as the works of native painters. The clearly marked dissimilarity of these serves to strengthen still more the presumption, that the purely Greek compositions so much more frequently found in Etruscan tombs were the productions of Greek artists on their own native soil, and surrounded by none but pure Hellenic influences.

We have dwelt so long upon the interesting questions connected with the Greek vases in their bearing on the history of ancient art, that we have left ourselves but little space to touch upon the not less numerous points of interest that they present in their relations with the history, the mythology, and the literature of ancient Greece. But we cannot conclude this article without endeavouring, at least, to point out to the classical scholar a few instances of that close connexion which may be traced between this branch of the fine arts and the contemporary literature of the country where both were alike produced. We are the more desirous to do this, because in

* The characteristic peculiarities of this style, and the inferences that may be drawn from them, are admirably stated by Jahn, in his excellent introduction to the catalogue of the Munich vases, pp. ccxix—ccxxi. : a work of which we cannot but wish that Mr. Birch had made more use.

this country, the study of archæology is but too much neglected; it forms no part of the ordinary training of our classical scholars at the Universities, and is rarely taken up by them in after life. It is generally considered as the exclusive province of the professed antiquarian, who has seldom undergone that early training in accurate scholarship which is regarded — and we think with perfect justice — by the student from Oxford or Cambridge as the indispensable foundation of sound classical knowledge. Unfortunately Mr. Birch's book is not one calculated to dispel the unfavourable impression thus prevalent concerning the scholarship of antiquarians; and we must admit that this country has produced no work connected with ancient art which can for a moment be compared with those of Gerhard or Welcher, of Thiersch or Karl Otfried Müller.

And yet we cannot but think that many a first-class man from Oxford or Cambridge would find a fresh source of interest in the monuments of antiquity which are thus ready to his hand, and that he could not take a glance, however cursory, through the vase room of the British Museum, or turn over the illustrative works of Gerhard or Lenormant, without being struck with the many points of contact they present with his previous studies. Even among the quaint and fanciful monsters of the earliest vases, the reader of Aristophanes — and what classical scholar is not? — will recognise with pleasure, among sirens and harpies and other nondescripts, the portraiture of that 'very strange fowl,' the Ihippalektryon, or 'horse-cock,' that cost poor Bacchus a sleepless night to divine what manner of bird it could be.* The Homeric scholar again, — though none of the existing representations on vases can pretend to an antiquity at all approaching to that of the immortal poems — must nevertheless contemplate with interest the most ancient pictures of these familiar scenes, and can hardly fail to derive some assistance in picturing them to his own imagination, by seeing how they were reproduced in that of the Greeks themselves, in the days of Æschylus and Pindar.

The paintings indeed which *directly* illustrate the events related in the Iliad are not very numerous, and form but a small portion of the long gallery of pictures from the heroic ages preserved to us on vases. But among them we find several of the leading incidents and most interesting episodes of the poem ;

ἐγὼ γούν

ἤδη ποτ' ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ νυκτὸς διηγρύπνησθαι
τὸν ξουθὸν ἱππαλεκτρυόνα ζητῶν, τίς ἐστὶν ἕρμις.

ARISTOPH. *Ranæ*, 932..

such as the parting of Briseïs and Achilles; the combat of Paris with Menelaus; the capture of Dolon and the horses of Rhesus; the death of Patroclus, and the funeral games in his honour; Vulcan forging for Achilles the sacred arms, and Thetis with her attendant Nereids bringing them to her son. The last combat and death of Hector is a favourite subject; and in one instance we see Achilles preparing to drag the body of his slaughtered foe around the sepulchre of Patroclus, whose shade or spirit (clad in complete armour, like the ghost in Hamlet) hovers over his tomb, apparently about to gloat over the vengeance inflicted on his enemy. Still more interesting are those vases which recall to us that most touching of all scenes in the Iliad (or in any other poem) when the aged Priam suddenly presents himself in the tent of Achilles, and, kneeling at his feet, kisses 'those dreaded hands that had slain so many of his sons.'

Far more numerous are the representations of incidents in the Trojan war that either preceded or followed the events related in the Iliad. We are certainly not disposed to adopt the explanation of this circumstance suggested by Mr. Birch — that the Homeric poems did not, in the age of the earlier vases, enjoy the same paramount reputation which they afterwards attained — a supposition negatived by the whole history of Greek literature. The reason is obvious enough. The Iliad was merely one great episode in the long cycle of mythical history — 'the tale of Troy divine,' which, after being current in a more detached and irregular form throughout the Hellenic world, was embodied in the series of poems known as the Epic Cycle; and the reason pointed out by Aristotle why so few tragedies were based upon the Iliad, as compared with other parts of the Trojan story, will apply with nearly equal force to the pictures on our vases. That great poem formed one organic whole in its epic unity, while the inferior poems of the Epic Cycle — inferior among other reasons for the want of this very unity — abounded in incidents which, from their detached and unconnected nature, might each form the subject of a separate composition. The same wide field of poetic legend was open to the painter as to the dramatic poet, and both were alike familiar, from their earliest years, with these beautiful stories in their pristine simplicity.

For we must not forget that these legends were to the Greeks of the early ages not mere poetic fictions, but living realities. The artists of those days did not only admire the tales of the poets, but they believed them. Hence it was not their purpose to illustrate a scene from Homer as a modern

painter does one from Shakspeare or Spenser, but to represent the scene itself as they supposed it to have occurred. The details supplied by the poet's fancy had doubtless been assimilated by their own minds, and worked up into their conception of the event; but it was still the event itself, and not the creation of the poet, which they intended to depict. In later times, indeed, a change had in some degree come over this feeling; and some of the vases of the best period afford indications that they are (in the modern sense) illustrations of Homer rather than scenes from the war of Troy; but it was not till the declining periods of the art that we find the change complete. Scenes from the tragic, and even from the comic, poets were introduced upon vases of the latest style; but nothing of the kind can be found on those of the earlier periods, during which the traditionary feeling was preserved in its original purity.

We cannot attempt to follow the artists of the vases through the wide field of ancient mythology, over which they were free to roam at will. But it may be worth while to observe that the same marked predilection for particular subjects, to the neglect of others apparently of equal or even greater interest, which distinguishes the later periods of Græco-Roman art, is found also on the vases of the earlier styles. The battles with the Amazons, the combat with the Centaurs, the chase of the Calydonian boar, are repeated again and again; while the incidents of the voyage of the Argonauts, so fertile in striking episodes, are rarely found, and only on vases of the latest periods. The same thing may be remarked of the wars against Thebes, and indeed of the whole cycle of Theban legends, from Cadmus to the Epigoni. Among the heroes whose exploits are the most prominent Hercules occupies unquestionably the first place; every incident of his life, from his birth to his apotheosis, may be illustrated from paintings on different vases, and many of them, such as his combat with the Nemean lion, the capture of the Erymanthian boar, and the contest with Apollo for the tripod at Delphi, are found repeated upon numerous vases of different periods and from different localities. Next to Hercules comes Theseus, the tutelary hero of Athens, a circumstance that has been urged as an additional proof of the Attic origin of the vases in question. Nor is the argument without weight; for though it may be admitted that the celebrity of Theseus was such as to entitle him to rank among the heroes of Greece in general, rather than of Athens in particular, yet the same thing might be said of several other heroes, whose exploits on the contrary are rarely found.

Historical subjects, properly so called—Mr. Gladstone must excuse us for not including the events of the Trojan war in this category—are of rare occurrence. The same predilection for the heroic and mythical periods of their history which was so characteristic of the early Greek literature, pervades also every branch of their fine arts, and is conspicuous in the vase paintings, especially on those of the older and purer styles. The only instances, indeed, of what can be called strictly historical subjects, are the burning of Cræsus on the funeral pile, and the meeting of Alcæus and Sappho; both of them belonging to the third period, but in the ‘strong’ style, and retaining much of an antiquated character about them.* It is hardly necessary to add, that both of these are of a date long subsequent to that of the personages whom they represent. On the other hand, the very curious vase belonging to the Duc de Luynes, and figured by Mr. Birch as the frontispiece to his first volume, which represents the weighing out of the *silphium* (the precious drug of Cyrene), in the presence of Arcesilas, king of that country, may perhaps be a contemporary picture of a custom wholly strange and foreign to the Greeks. But in this respect, as in several others, that remarkable vase is too isolated an exception to serve as an authority. The cup from Vulci (also figured by Mr. Birch), on which appears the name of Anacreon, is another instance of a historical *personage*, though we cannot determine the incident which it is intended to represent. Of the various other attempts that have been made to identify historical subjects, where these are unsupported by inscriptions, few or none can pretend to be anything beyond mere conjectures.

It is one of the merits of Mr. Birch's book, that he has, in this instance as in most others, kept himself clear from those vague and fanciful speculations which are the besetting sin of too many writers in this as in most other branches of antiquarian inquiry. The researches of M. Panofka, in particular, as well as of the late Dr. Emil Braun, notwithstanding their learning and ingenuity, are disfigured throughout by this tendency to far-fetched and questionable theories. So great, indeed, is their ingenuity, and so beautiful the symmetry of the ‘airy vision’ they construct, that it requires considerable care in their readers to observe how utterly baseless is the goodly fabric before them. We are the more forward to acknowledge the merits of Mr. Birch's book, because we have found ourselves compelled to notice severely those defects which go far to mar its usefulness; and which are the more provoking, because the greater part of them might have been easily avoided.

ART. IV. — 1. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps*.

Par M. GUIZOT. Vol. I. Paris: 1858.

2. *Memoirs to illustrate the History of my Time*. By F. GUIZOT.

Vol. I. London: 1858.

3. *M. de Châteaubriand, sa Vie, ses écrits, son influence littéraire et politique sur son temps* (*La Tribune Moderne, Première partie*).

Par M. VILLEMMAIN. • Paris: 1858.

4. *Histoire du Gouvernement Parlementaire en France*. 1814-

1848. *Précédée d'une Introduction*. Par M. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE. Vols. I. and II. Paris: 1857.

THESE works are the offspring of very different minds; and the course of public affairs, as well as the impulses of personal character, have tended to divide rather than to unite their respective authors. M. Guizot relates with a stern simplicity of language the occurrences he has witnessed in political life. M. Villemain describes with more animation, and not without a touch of satire, the life of another celebrated performer in the last generation of Frenchmen. M. Duvergier de Hauranne, whose own parliamentary life was spent in opposition, has undertaken the task of tracing the constitutional government of France from its infancy to its dissolution, and of weighing in the scales of history its errors and its misfortunes. Probably the view taken of any given event or act of policy by these distinguished men would be as different now as it was amidst the turmoil of contending parties, and we shall not attempt to reconcile their divisions. But on one fundamental point their intention is the same. They represent the great party of constitutional freedom and limited monarchy in France with as much fidelity in these days of proscription and defeat, as they did when all the powers of the State lay within their grasp. Whatever else may have changed in France, it will ever be remembered to the honour of her parliamentary statesmen, that ten years after the calamitous revolution which levelled the throne and the liberties of the nation in the dust, not one of those illustrious men who had served her in freedom condescended to govern her under despotism. The possession of absolute power, the acquisition of wealth, the desire of what are called honours, may be more easily satisfied by a successful minister under the Imperial régime than amidst the perils and resistance of parliamentary life; but these vulgar attractions have not seduced a single man of real eminence from the principles he had embraced, and history can produce no finer example of constancy to an unsuccessful cause.

This sentiment has dictated every page of the volumes now before us. To retrace step by step the outset and the progress of a free government in France, as it existed under the elder and the younger branch of the Bourbons; to preserve a record of the intentions, the difficulties, the perils, and the principles which marked the course of that great experiment; and to hand down to another generation that momentous problem of the union of freedom and authority which the lives and labours of three preceding generations have failed to solve, are now the tasks which not unworthily employ the retirement of these eminent men. The active portion of their own lives is past. With the consciousness of great efforts directed to noble objects, which secure to them personally a lasting place in the annals of their country, is doubtless mingled that sense of disappointment which is rarely absent even from the least unsuccessful of human achievements: but their faith in the principles which have hitherto governed and guided the progress of civilisation is indestructible, and the failure of their last venture has not driven them either to seek a refuge behind the ranks of military force, or to abandon that cause which can alone redeem the French Revolution from its inconsistencies and its crimes. We know not what the future may have in store, for that depends on the temper and spirit of a generation of men who have at present given to the world no intelligible indication of their political opinions; but the parliamentary statesmen of the late monarchy, equally distinguished by literary ability and by political eloquence, have left no part of their task unperformed, since the sources of the history of their eventful times will hereafter be found to be amply illustrated by their own writings.

Amongst this band of great and honourable men we think that M. Guizot will retain in history, as he has occupied in life, the first and highest place. Other writers, gifted with livelier powers of imagination, and appealing more directly to the sentiment of their contemporaries, may, like M. de Châteaubriand, have exercised for a time a more powerful influence on the literature of France. Other orators may have kindled fiercer passions in the audiences they addressed, and may leave on some memories the impression of more intense dramatic power. Other statesmen have enjoyed far more of popular sympathy in their day, for they fought under a banner to which M. Guizot was steadily opposed; and, whilst they spoke with the energy of assailants, his public life has been, for the most part, spent in the service of the crown and in the discharge of the positive duties of government. But in the depth and variety

of his literary labours, which have enlarged the philosophy of history and extended our knowledge of the laws that manifest themselves in all human affairs; in the force and precision of his oratory, which at one swoop could bend an assembly or crush a foe; and in the systematic consistency of his whole political life, which realised in action the opinions of his closet, and gave the authority of a minister to the principles of a philosopher. M. Guizot has had no equal, either in his own country, or, as far as we know, in any other. The wisdom of some of his writings, and the felicity of some of his orations, may not improperly be compared to the productions of Burke; the ascendancy he enjoyed in the Executive government and the Parliament of France was probably greater than any minister has possessed in a constitutional State since the death of Mr. Pitt. But in M. Guizot the speculative genius of the one was united to the practical authority of the other; and though each of these great Englishmen may have possessed his own peculiar qualification in a still higher degree, M. Guizot stands before them both in the rare union of the contemplative and active faculties. To have written the 'History of Civilization in France,' and to have occupied the most important position in the government of France for a longer period than any minister since the Duc de Choiseul, are joint achievements in literature and in politics which no other man has performed.

It has been M. Guizot's fate to survive this brilliant and protracted period of his existence, and his literary honours are still increasing, whilst an unparalleled revulsion has destroyed, not only his own parliamentary and administrative system, but even the monarchy he served. He has devoted this interval of seclusion to a dispassionate survey of the historical events of his more active years, and in the first pages of the volume before us he states the reasons which induce him to publish these Memorials in his lifetime. On personal grounds he thinks it a more dignified course to anticipate, in some degree, the judgment of posterity; on public grounds he holds, that 'an exact knowledge of the faults of their forefathers, and the reasons of their failure, should not be withheld from the succeeding generations,' until the moral of the lesson is lost or forgotten. M. Guizot's life has been spent alternately in defending freedom against absolutism, and order against revolution, — two great causes which, rightly understood, are one, since it is their separation which ruins both of them in succession. The sum of his experience amounts to this: that, so long as liberty has not repudiated the spirit of the revolution, and so long as authority has not repudiated despotism, France will be tossed from one

convulsion to another, and from failure to failure. A dreary prospect! yet a prospect on which M. Guizot himself looks without despair, so unshaken is his faith in the ultimate progress of good government by free institutions. Many a heart less firmly strung than his has given way, it must be confessed, under the influence of these repeated disappointments. 'I have lost my cause,' said M. Royer-Collard, in a letter written in August, 1823, before the constitutional monarchy had felt its hardest blows, but when M. Guizot was himself acting with the opposition, 'I have lost my cause, and I am very much afraid you will lose yours also; for you will have lost it from the day when that cause becomes a bad one. In these sad reflections, the heart is oppressed but not resigned.' And again, a few days later, in language not inapplicable to the present time, he adds: 'In this profound repose, still in sight of all that is going on, and of all that awaits us, the weariness of a life consumed in vain aspirations and in disappointed hopes does sometimes make itself felt.'

From these painful emotions, however, M. Guizot himself is singularly exempt, partly from his active literary pursuits, partly from his deep enjoyment of the domestic affections, partly from the charm of cordial spirits and vital temperament, happily blended with the higher powers. The experience of life has rendered him rather less lenient to himself, and more tolerant of others. The contests of Parliament, and the exercise of power followed by the extremest vicissitudes of political fortune, have not left behind them the bitterness of personal mortification; and though no patriotic Frenchman can look back on the annals of his country without many subjects of regret, that regret attaches to the imperfect success of a great and noble cause, not to the efforts which were lavished in support of it.

This conviction imparts a higher degree of interest than they would otherwise possess to these contributions to recent history. It must be confessed that the records of extinct charters and dismembered cabinets — of ministries as thoroughly dissolved as the coalitions once opposed to them — of forgotten debates on which the fate of nations was once supposed to turn — of mute oratory which once roused the fiercest passions — and of unmeaning divisions carried with the exultation of immortal triumphs, are apt to vanish like a dissolving view into that limbo which covers with friendly oblivion nine tenths of our feverish contentions and abortive enterprises. It is not easy to recall even to our own minds, without a smile of indifference, those scenes in which the politicians of the day seemed to play a part so disproportionate to their real influence upon the aggregate of human

affairs; and the gigantic shapes which swept across our disc in the light of the present, diminish with infinite velocity as they vanish into the past.

‘Hi motus animorum atque hæc certamina tanta
Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescent.’

The attempt, therefore, to excite any lively interest in posterity by the description, however ingenious, of the movements of political parties long defunct, is altogether hopeless. Statesmen and philosophers look to history for broad principles of action and for their results; but a far larger class of men look to history, and with a more genial interest, for the sake of the actors themselves who figured on the scene. A human sympathy is at the bottom of it. We care infinitely less for the greatest controversies which have divided nations, than for the men who impersonated each struggling and conflicting cause; and a large proportion of the historical knowledge and opinions propagated in the world might be traced to the influence of those who retain a figure and a presence not to be put aside. What they actually said or did is imperfectly known to most of us; but we are concerned to know what they *were*; and thus, though in a very different sense from the extravagances of modern superstition, history surrounds us with a cloud of witnesses, and long after the spirit of dead parties has flitted away, we follow with unabated interest the characters, the motives, the personal appearance, and, in a word, the lives of those who were engaged in them.

M. Guizot, in these historical memoirs of his own time, has laid down some of the broad principles of action and some of their results, to which we just now alluded. That is the object and that the value of this work. But he makes no concessions to the curiosity of the larger class of readers, who care more for the author than for his book, more for the statesman than his policy. We readily understand the motives of good taste and reserve which restrain a man from talking about himself, and still more from laying bare to the public eye, during his own lifetime, those early associations and those domestic influences which are so powerful in the formation of character. Such things have been done by writers like M. de Lamartine, though, for the honour of literature, the example ought not to be followed. But M. Guizot has perhaps gone to the other extreme. The word ‘Memoirs’ conveys in English a more precise biographical sense than it does in French; and it may be argued that the expression ‘*Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de mon temps*,’—or, as Mr. Cole has translated it, ‘Memoirs

'to illustrate the history of my time,'—does not properly imply more than the title of Bishop Burnet's History, and has no autobiographical signification at all. The truth is, that it never was the intention of M. Guizot to publish to the world the incidents and emotions of his own life, and no man is more averse to that species of intrusion on domestic or personal privacy. Nor has he aspired in this publication to leave behind him a complete history of the age in which he lived. The objections to such an attempt are obvious and insurmountable. Until men have mouldered in their graves for half a century, it is impossible to say all that is known, still less all that is thought, about them. M. Guizot's intention, then, in committing these volumes to the press in his lifetime, is simply to relate the share he has himself borne in the events of his day, whether as a thinker or as an actor. He has confined himself strictly within these limits; and although the interest of the work would have been enhanced by more ample references to his own life, and especially to the occurrences of his youth, which left a peculiar stamp on his character, the public have certainly no right to complain of the limits he has thought fit to set to his own labours.

The time of M. Guizot's birth, and the circumstances in which he was placed in early youth, were favourable to the peculiar position he was destined to fill in the history of his country. He was barely seven years old when his father fell a victim to the sanguinary violence of the Reign of Terror in Languedoc, and he fled with his mother to Geneva, where he pursued his education with success,—not a solitary example of steadfast adherence to the cause of rational political freedom and religious toleration imbibed from that Republican and Protestant soil. By a rare exception, in the days which followed after the destructive passage of the eighteenth century and the French Revolution, François Guizot entered upon life with fixed principles. Throughout a life of endless changes he has remained unchanged. From early youth the device which he assumed when he took the embassy to London, '*Via recta brevissima*,' was already his maxim. He had, in truth, nothing in common with the paroxysms of military excitement through which France passed in the first twenty years of his life; and he was brought up under the eyes of a mother who belonged to that pious and dauntless race of Huguenot Christians which had defied, for upwards of a century, the dragonades and persecutions of the court of Versailles. Fifty years later, another great upheaving of French society, directed against her own son and the king he had served, drove that high-couraged and high-minded

woman, unchanged alike by prosperity and by adversity, to England. The exertion was beyond her strength, and in a few days she expired amongst us. But to the last moment of her existence she retained the clearness of judgment and force of will which had fitted her to mould the character of a statesman.

Under these peculiar influences the eminent man whose name is inseparably connected with almost every page of the constitutional history of France, grew to manhood, and prepared to play his part in the world; and though it may be premature to trace in detail the character of so illustrious a contemporary, we are invited by the appearance of this volume to note some outline of its leading features. To the energy, and even passion, of a Southern nature, M. Guizot has throughout life applied the self-knowledge and the self-control of a cool and powerful intellect. Born for public life, and ambitious of the great prizes of political power, no man ever took less account of the external advantages of success. Like the ancient Greek, it was his pride, 'to struggle with glory 'naked;' not for her ornaments, but for herself. The simplicity of his manners and his life remained quite unaltered in an age of luxury and during a life of power. He walked, looking to higher things; intent on the exercise of freedom, the consolidation of authority, and the work of government. These objects were engrafted in his mind upon a sense of public and private rights; and, though he fell at last under a storm of excessive unpopularity, no man, we think, was ever found to impute to him an act of personal interest, or an abuse of authority to the injury of another. Proud he was as a minister, but entirely without vanity, and, except under fierce provocation, without arrogance. Once, indeed, the haughty passion broke forth, when he thundered forth to the Opposition, baying like baffled hounds at the foot of the Tribune, 'Vous n'arriverez jamais à la hauteur de mon dédain.' But to those with whom he acted his confidence and his friendship were freely given, given without reserve, and given for ever. Whatever austerity there might be in the outward demeanour of the statesman, it vanished altogether under the influence of the domestic circle and the ties of private life; for these ties became so strong, that it seemed as if it were impossible for M. Guizot to withdraw his attachment even from those who had ceased to be worthy of it. A current of the warmest feeling ran beneath the marble surface; and the knight who rode proudly round the parliamentary lists in complete armour, was more easily touched by the slightest appeal of a friend than by the

stoutest blows of an opponent. Of a sanguine disposition and an even temperament, M. Guizot has known more of the pleasures of ambition than of its pangs; and, in his long public career, the animosities he may have felt or excited have been left to die away, whilst the nobler bonds of common action and common hopes remain. In this temper he has reached an age at which he may fairly claim the right to record his judgment on others and on himself; and such is our opinion of his sincerity, that we are content to leave him in the capacity of an historian to deal with his own actions as a statesman.

It has been acutely remarked that some men are eminent in public life by the possession, in a high degree, of the characteristic qualities of their nation,—as, for example, the Duke of Wellington was superlatively an Englishman; but that other men rise to equal eminence by the possession of qualities very remote from those of the people they have to govern. In French history, more especially, examples are not rare of great statesmen, great writers, and great soldiers, wanting in the popular elements of the French character, but framed in a stronger mould, who have exercised a preponderating authority over their countrymen. To this class of thinkers and rulers M. Guizot belongs; a student and a liberal under the military rule of the First Empire; a Protestant and a man of the people in the presence of the clerical and aristocratic reaction of the Restoration; a professor and a journalist when the crown began to wage war on the rights of intelligence; a minister when it became necessary to allay the tempest of the Revolution of 1830, and to protect liberty from the excesses threatened in her name. M. Guizot has alternately laboured to stem the tide of authority and that of popular feeling; he has never attempted to run before the gale. He seems to have been formed for resistance; and although no greater services could be rendered to his country than the courageous opposition he offered to the reactionary tendencies of the Restoration—though he rendered equal services by resisting the unreasonable and seditious attacks of the populace on the throne of Louis-Philippe—yet this habit of mind and policy became in the end his greatest danger, for it was protracted until the monarchy itself perished under the strain. By the strength of his own convictions, by the results of his own experience, and by the combinations of his own powerful intellect, M. Guizot formed and constructed a system of government. We shall presently endeavour to trace from this volume some of its characteristics. But we may remark at once, as an illustration of the character of its author, that by the very nature of his genius and dis-

position, this system existed as a thing apart from the genius and disposition of the bulk of the French nation; and that when the day of trial came, it wanted a strong and secure hold on the interests, the affections, and the intelligent cooperation of the people.

His views of government were based on the idea of a constitutional monarchy whilst France was still struggling with the unsettled elements of an unparalleled revolution. The idea of such a monarchy, whether inspired by the example of the British constitution, or by philosophical deduction of a more abstract nature, did the highest honour to the minds that conceived it and to the men who practised it. The same profound spirit of analysis may be traced in M. Guizot's masterly survey of the early institutions of France, and in all his historical writings. Nowhere can he be accused of superficial observation, or of an undue regard to the accidents of history. To this very volume the same remark is applicable; it abounds in matter of the utmost value and interest to the mind which searches to the root of events; but it would be far more entertaining and exciting to the world at large if it dealt more unreservedly with the actual occurrences of life. It is with political history, and especially with that of our own times, as with the ocean: the surface only is agitated, and, in its sereher depths, the tempest is said to be unfelt. We do not dispute that the science of government, like the science of navigation, rests upon certain principles, which may be evolved from experience and philosophical inquiry. But, in the practice of the art, a large allowance must be made for the influence of superficial causes, or the most accurate navigator may find himself considerably out of his reckoning. Throughout the period to which these Memoirs relate, superficial causes of various kinds were acting powerfully on the French nation; and the result has shown that, although a very large amount of thought and labour was employed to steer the prescribed course in safety, the vessel has not reached the port for which it started. The wisest of the Greeks underwent an *Odyssey* of adventures before the shores of Ithaca gladdened his sight.

The constitutional monarchy of France, established in 1814 upon the restoration of the House of Bourbon, was fated to affront in succession every kind of danger. It was first assailed and that within a few months after the Peace of Paris, by a convulsion originating in the military and Bonapartist spirit of the army, which was roused to fanaticism by the return of Napoleon from Elba; and the first Charter of Louis XVIII. was sacrificed to the shortlived and desperate Imperialist reaction of

the Hundred Days. The fall of Napoleon was immediately followed by the second Restoration, and the experiment of governing by Chambers and a responsible Ministry was repeated. But at this juncture another peril of the most opposite kind befel the king's administration. A fever of royalism seized the legislature. The party which this revolution had raised to power was '*plus royaliste que le Roi*;' the remnant of the French aristocracy, who had just returned from exile or raised itself from the dust, were eager to declare war on the most important results of the great social change France had undergone; and had it not been for the genuine moderation of the king himself, and the firmness with which he supported ministers like the Duc de Richelieu and M. Decazes against the interference of the priests and nobles, a fresh catastrophe would have speedily ensued. But the trials of the constitution were not ended. Before fifteen years had elapsed, Charles X. violated the conditions of his brother's Charter, and overthrew the balance of power by an absolutist *coup d'état*, against the deliberate remonstrances of the lawful representatives of the nation. The Revolution of July was the consequence of this outrage, and the crown was transferred to the younger branch of the royal family, holding it not by any supposed divine right of legitimacy, but by the election of the Chambers. Thus far the army, the aristocracy, and the prerogative of the crown had been successively arrayed against the institutions of moderate freedom. But they had happily prevailed over these formidable adversaries. A greater peril was yet to come. Before eighteen years had passed away, the people rose against the throne; the middle classes deserted the sovereign of their choice; the restricted electoral body on which the Chamber of Deputies rested was swept away by universal suffrage; and the country fell back into a state of anarchy, from which it was again rescued by the grasp of military despotism.

Such were the perils against which the men who sought to rule France in the spirit of parliamentary government have had to contend; and it will at once be perceived, that, whilst their object was solely to consolidate the institutions in which they proudly and fondly believed, they had to deal with circumstances calling for very different modes of treatment.

M. Guizot may be said to have entered the world at the first Restoration, when he was twenty-seven years of age, a time of life well adapted to the part he had to perform. Previously to that event, and in the latter years of the Empire, he had made some acquaintances in the literary society of Paris, where the salons of Madame d'Houdetot and Madame de Rémusat still col-

lected the scattered remains of French society — that society of which M. de Talleyrand said, that no one who had not lived in Paris in the years preceding 1789 could tell what it is to live. M. Suard opened to him the columns of the 'Publiciste,' and one of his first essays was a defence of the 'Martyrs' of M. de Châteaubriand against his detractors. Even earlier than this, in 1807, Madame de Stäel had invited him to dine at Coppet, where he had quoted, in a voice that revealed the future orator, the following sentence from an article of the day, which bears the stamp of M. de Châteaubriand's rhetorical power: —

'Lorsque, dans le silence de l'abjection, l'on n'entend plus retentir que la chaîne de l'esclave et la voix du délateur, lorsque tout tremble devant le tyran, et qu'il est aussi dangereux d'encourir sa faveur que de mériter sa disgrâce, l'historien paraît chargé de la vengeance des peuples. C'est en vain que Néron prospère: Tacite est déjà né dans l'Empire; il croît inconnu auprès des cendres de Germanicus; et déjà l'intègre Providence livre à un enfant obscur la gloire du maître du monde.'

Such thoughts, such words as these, repeated with enthusiasm, when Napoleon was at the pinnacle of his power, belonged not to the servants of that ephemeral greatness, but to the liberators of an oppressed country; and, in spite of an abortive attempt to place the young aspirant as an Auditor at the Council of State, M. Guizot held no office under the Empire, except that of Professor of Modern History in the University, a chair he owed to the liberal discernment of M. de Fontanes.

'Soon after he had appointed me,' says our author, 'he invited me to dine at his country-house at Courbevoie. Seated near him at table, we talked of the classics, and of different modes of tuition, with the freedom and animation of old acquaintances. The conversation turned on the Latin poets and their commentators. I spoke with praise of Heyne's great edition of Virgil, the celebrated Göttingen professor, and of his dissertations. M. de Fontanes smartly attacked the German philologists, declaring that they had added nothing to what was known before, and that Heyne was not more conversant with Virgil and antiquity than the Père de la Rue. He was extremely out of humour with German literature in general, and held the German philosophers, poets, and historians alike beneath his notice. I defended them with the confidence of my own conviction and my youth, till M. de Fontanes said, turning to his other neighbours — "Oh, these Protestants! There is no making them knock under." (P. 16.)

Yet he appreciated the spirit and independence of his young friend; and when Guizot refused soon afterwards to insert a

phrase of panegyric on the Emperor in his opening lecture, Fontanes was ready to take the blame on himself.

With these sentiments, and with his acknowledged talents, it is not wonderful that M. Guizot was, upon the establishment of the government of Louis XVIII., at once attached to the Ministry of the Interior, under the Abbé de Montesquieu. Already the full signification of that dispute between the Houses of Bourbon and of Buonaparte, which has been prolonged to our own times, was perfectly apparent to M. Guizot's mind. He, as a Protestant and a man of the people, had certainly no sympathy with the state of things which the Revolution of 1789 had overthrown. The clergy and the nobles were nothing to him: but he had the candour to perceive that no free government could be established in France on a broad and lasting basis, which did not embrace all the great elements of society, by uniting the throne with the altered condition of the nation, and the upper classes with the people. The object of M. Guizot's attachment and hope was a just policy, and a freedom regulated by law. He despaired of them under the Empire; he hoped for them under the Restoration. It was this hope of peace and liberty which caused the king to be hailed with acclamations by subjects who a short time before had almost forgotten his existence; and the attempt to stigmatise the Restoration as the work of foreign bayonets is an absurd perversion of sense and justice, when it is remembered that these foreign bayonets were brought into France, not for the purpose of proclaiming Louis XVIII., but solely for that of terminating the rule of arrogance and aggression which the Empire had inflicted on Europe. The contrast between the position of the Buonapartist dynasty sprung from the Revolution, and the dynasty which emanates from the old monarchy of France, has nowhere been expressed with greater force and truth than by M. Guizot in this volume. In the former he sees the natural representative of the revolutionary principle, which can only retain the authority it claims to wield by despotic and military power; in the latter he sees the representative of a right which can only obtain the assent and support of the nation upon the basis of a constitutional compact; for the one cannot subsist without the restraint of absolute authority, nor the other without the support of free institutions. 'Absolute power, in France, can only belong to the Revolution and its descendants, for they alone can, for I know not how long, satisfy the mass of the population as to their interests, though they withhold from them the securities of freedom. To the House of Bourbon and its partisans absolute power is impossible: in their hands France will be

'free; she will only accept their government under her own control.' Never was a more acute observation made. The infatuation of the multitude in France for the name of Napoleon, is the very circumstance that renders it so easy for a Buonapartist ruler to deprive them of all liberty: the suspicions of the nation, though adverse to the Bourbons, are in truth, effectual guarantees of free government under their sceptre.

M. Guizot had seen, before his entry into public life, the intolerable burdens thrown by the excesses of the Empire on France. The aspect of Paris, with its great public works undertaken by the genius of the Emperor, but stopped for want of money and for want of men; the country impoverished; the population wasted: and all these outward symptoms of distress aggravated by the gloom of reverses and the uncertainty of the future. Yet the violence and arrogance of Napoleon himself, both before and after the Hundred Days, increased in proportion to the perils of his position. When the Deputies waited upon him, on the 1st January, 1814, he insulted them to their faces. 'Who are you,' he exclaimed, 'who presume to attack me? It is I who am the representative of the nation. To fall out with me is to fall out with France. I have a title, and you have none. M. Lainé, your Reporter, is a bad man, who corresponds with England through Advocate Desèze. I have my eye upon him. M. Raymond is a liar.'

And the same intemperance betrayed itself in a hundred ways after his return from Elba, in spite of the absurd attempts made by a certain class of persons to liberalise the institutions of the Empire.

'To an intelligent spectator it was a strange, and on both sides a somewhat ludicrous spectacle, to watch Napoleon and the chiefs of the Liberal party engaged together, not in contention, but in the endeavour to persuade, to seduce, and to gain over one another. It required no very close insight to perceive that neither side was much in earnest in this sort of discussion. Both parties knew that the question would be settled elsewhere. If Napoleon had conquered the armies of Europe, he would not long have remained the rival of Lafayette or the disciple of Benjamin Constant; and no sooner was he defeated at Waterloo than M. de Lafayette and his friends set to work to overthrow him.'

The true position of the liberal party in France during the brief return of the Imperial government, has been described with great research and ability by M. Duvergier de Hauranne in the second volume of his '*History of French Parliamentary Government*.' The '*Acte additionnel*' was an idle and unnecessary compromise between the system of the Empire and

the system of the Limited Monarchy; and there can be no stronger proof of the conscious debility of Napoleon himself, than that he should have condescended to seek popularity at such a price.

In fact, he regarded this counterfeit liberalism with the greatest scorn. 'You are depriving me of my past,' said he to his doctors. 'What are you doing with my eleven years' reign? I have some rights my own, I think; and Europe' knows it. The new constitution must be connected with the old one, which gives it the sanction of several years of glory and success.' (P. 70.) Still more absurd was the attempt to revive the popular spirit of 1792 in the Faubourgs of Paris, by convoking the working classes, under the name of 'Confédérés,' to a public demonstration.

'I was crossing the Tuileries garden,' says M. Guizot, 'a few days afterwards, whilst about a hundred of these *Fédérés*, ill-looking fellows, were bawling "Vive l'Empereur!" under the windows of the palace, and calling on him to show himself. He was not prompt to satisfy their desire. At last a window opened; he appeared and waved his hand; but the window was instantly closed again; and I distinctly saw Napoleon draw back with a shrug of the shoulders, indicating his disgust at having to lend himself to demonstrations which displeased him by their character, and did not satisfy him by their force.' (P. 92.)

Well might the Great Emperor say, as he is reported to have said, at such a sight: 'Si j'avais su jusqu'où je serais obligé de descendre, je serais resté à l'île d'Elbe.*'

'It was,' says M. Guizot, 'the sad fate of the Government of the Hundred Days, that the authority of the moral sense of the nation was on the side of the Royalists its opponents, and that the public conscience, clearly or obscurely, willingly or reluctantly, justified the strictures passed on its origin. My friends and myself were attentive observers of the progress of this situation of the Empire, and of this state of public feeling; and we soon arrived at a profound conviction that Napoleon would fall and that Louis XVIII. would remount the throne. And whilst this was our view of the future, we were more and more convinced that in the deplorable condition into which France had been thrown, both at home and abroad, by the enterprise of the return from Elba, the Restoration of Louis XVIII. offered the best chance of recovering a regular government in the country and peace with a suitable position in Europe. In public life, prudence and duty require a man to entertain no illusions as to the nature of the disease, and to accept the remedy without flinching; however bitter it may be and however costly. I had not taken any active part in the first Restoration. I did not hesitate to unite my

* Lamartine's '*Histoire de la Restauration*,' livre 23. cap. xii.

exertions to those of my friends, in order to bring about the second Restoration in the manner most conducive to the dignity, the liberties, and the repose of France.'

We have quoted these words because they throw sufficient light on the subsequent conduct of M. Guizot, in a transaction which has on several occasions been made the subject of the bitterest insult and reproach to him. Believing that the termination of this revolutionary crisis, and the establishment of free institutions in France, were only to be hoped for by the fall of Napoleon and the return of the King, M. Guizot was induced by the friends with whom he acted to repair to Ghent, where Louis XVIII. then was, principally for the purpose of communicating to his Majesty the views of the constitutional royalists, to urge him to maintain the Charter, and to endeavour, if possible, to shake the influence of the reactionary party at the fugitive Court. These were the objects of M. Guizot's celebrated journey to Ghent; and with a view to the future political welfare of his country, the task was a patriotic one, and it was undertaken with high and generous motives. The surprise we feel on reading M. Guizot's very simple account of this curious journey arises not from the fact of his having gone there, but from that of his having been selected for such a mission. A young Protestant professor, who had served for a few months in the Ministry of the Interior, but who had no claim on the notice of the Court, is suddenly despatched from Paris to tell the King of France that his confidential advisers are not trusted by the nation; he obtains a private audience through the Duc de Duras, and the following singular interview takes place:—

'Two points have remained strongly imprinted upon my memory—the impotence and dignity of the King. There was in the aspect and attitude of this old man, seated immovably and as if nailed to his arm-chair, a haughty serenity, and, in the midst of his feebleness, a tranquil confidence in the power of his name and rights, which surprised and touched me. What I had to say could not fail to be displeasing to him; and from respect, not calculation, I began with what was agreeable: I spoke of the royalist feeling which day by day exhibited itself more vehemently in Paris. I then related to him several anecdotes and couplets of songs, in corroboration of this. Such light passages entertained and pleased him, as men are gratified with humorous recitals, who have no sources of gaiety within themselves.

I told him that the hope of his return was general. "But what is grievous, Sir, is that, while believing in the re-establishment of the monarchy, there is no confidence in its duration." "Why is this?" I continued; "when the great artisan of revolution is no longer there, monarchy will become permanent; it is clear that, if

Bonaparte returns to Elba, it will only be to break out again; but let him be disposed of, and there will be an end to revolutions also. — People cannot thus flatter themselves, Sire; they fear something beyond Bonaparte, they dread the weakness of the royal government; its wavering between old and new ideas, between past and present interests, and they fear the disunion, or at least the incoherence, of its ministers."

'The King made no reply. I persisted, and mentioned M. de Blacas. I said that I was expressly charged by men whom the King knew to be old, faithful, and intelligent servants, to represent to him the mistrust which attached itself to that name, and the evil that would result from it to himself. "I will fulfil all that I have promised in the Charter; names are not concerned with that; France has nothing to do with the friends I entertain in my palace, provided no act emanates from them injurious to the country." Speak to me of more serious causes of uneasiness." I entered into some details, and touched on various points of party intrigues and menaces. I also spoke to the King of the Protestants in the south, of their alarms, of the violence even of which, in some instances, they had already been the objects. "This is very bad," said he: "I will do all I can to stop it; but I cannot prevent everything, — I cannot, at the same time, be a liberal and an absolute king." He questioned me upon several recent occurrences, and respecting some members of the Imperial Administration. "There are two, Sire, who, knowing that I was about to seek an audience of the King, have requested me to mention their names, and to assure him of their devotion." "Who are they?"—"The Archchancellor and M. Molé." "For M. Molé, I rely upon him, and am glad of his support; I know his worth. As to M. Cambacérès, he is one of those whom I neither ought nor wish to hear named." I paused there. I was not ignorant that at that time the King was in communication with Fouché, a much more objectionable regicide than Cambacérès; but I was a little surprised that the secret relations caused by pressing emergency did not prevent him from maintaining aloud, and as a general theory, a line of conduct most natural under his circumstances. He was certainly far from foreseeing the disgust that would ensue from his connexion with the Duke of Otranto. He dismissed me with some commonplace words of kindness, leaving on me the impression of a sensible and liberal mind, outwardly imposing, shrewd with individuals, careful of appearances, thinking little, and not profoundly informed, and almost as incapable of the errors which destroy, as of the great strokes which establish the future of royal dynasties.' (P. 85.)

Considering the relative situations of the parties at this time, we cannot be surprised that Louis XVIII. did not discover in the young emissary who thus addressed him a future Prime Minister, and the greatest French orator of the age; and the wonder is rather that he received these representations with so much good-nature.

The battle of Waterloo, and the final abdication of Napoleon, brought about the catastrophe which M. Guizot and his friends had foreseen throughout the Hundred Days. They had done nothing to accelerate the defeat of the national arms, or to overthrow the Imperial government. Napoleon himself was hurrying on his armies to defeat, and his government to destruction. The leaders of the constitutional party, on the contrary, were silently endeavouring to prepare the means of restoring the royal authority on the basis of freedom, and of healing the divisions which had so fatally estranged whole classes of society. In their attempt they were, as the result has proved, only partially successful; for, of all the calamitous periods which have marked the course of the French Revolution, that of the Hundred Days was, by its effects, the most disastrous. It left the crown shorn of a considerable territory, and burdened with large additional charges for the maintenance of foreign armies; it left a high-spirited nation writhing under the anguish of a tremendous military defeat. Nor was this all.

‘The Hundred Days did France far more harm than the loss of blood and treasure they cost her. That epoch rekindled the old quarrel which the Empire had quelled and which the Charter sought to quench,—the quarrel between old and new France,—between the Emigration and the Revolution. The struggle which broke out afresh in 1815, as it had broken out in 1789, was not only a struggle between political parties, but between rival classes. . . . The deplorable incoherence of the apparent and the real state of society in France was suddenly brought to light by the events of 1815. The reaction excited by the Hundred Days destroyed in an instant the work of social pacification which had been going on in France for sixteen years, and abruptly called forth all the good and bad passions of the *ancien régime* against all the good or bad results of the Revolution.’ (P. 112.)

So that it was the Buonapartist and military reaction of the return from Elba which led immediately to the aristocratic and royalist reaction that followed the second Restoration—one excess begetting another, and both equally fatal to the cause of national freedom. At this moment the legislature was dissolved, and a general election took place, amidst so much excitement, that even the provisions and limitations of the Charter, as to the age both of the electors and the candidates, were suspended. The consequence was, that the Chamber of 1815, on which the arduous task of reconstituting a Parliamentary government in France had devolved, was totally deficient in the qualifications required of it. It was animated by aristocratic prejudices and counter-revolutionary passions—it sought to impose a policy

on the King and on the nation — and it lent itself to some of the most fatal measures which stained the early years of the Restoration.

At this time, however, a small but intelligent party of moderate Royalists was formed to protect the King's government and the King's authority from the violence of his own supporters. The party included men of very different characters and antecedents — M. de Serre, who had been an *émigré*, and had served in the army of Condé; M. Pasquier, M. Beugnot, M. de Barante, M. de Sainte Aulaire, who had entered public life under the Imperial administration; M. Royer-Collard and Camille Jordan, who were its strenuous opponents. To these men M. Guizot gave his confidence and the assistance of his pen, though several years elapsed before he sat with them in the Chamber of Deputies; to the principles of these men M. Guizot, whether in or out of office, has since devoted the activity of his life. Such was the origin of the famous *doctrinaires* — a school of political opinions rather than a party — who were destined eventually to exert a most remarkable influence over the legislature of France. They owed that influence to the honesty of their characters, and to their intellectual and oratorical power, far more than to their political sagacity, or to their sympathy with the bulk of the French nation. Even in the principles they consistently professed we think it is not difficult to discern the causes of their ultimate failure; but we are happy to receive from the most eminent member of the school a dispassionate statement of their views:

‘The ministerial majority was formed from two different although at that time closely united elements,—the centre, properly called the grand army of power, and the very limited staff of that army, who soon received the title of *doctrinaires*.

‘I shall say of the centre of our assemblies since 1814, what I have just said of M. Cuvier; it has been misunderstood and calumniated, when servility and a rabid desire for place have been named as its leading characteristics. With it, as with others, personal interests have had their weight, and have looked for their gratification; but one general and just idea formed the spirit and bond of union of the party,—the idea that, in the present day, after so many revolutions, society required established government, and that to government all good citizens were bound to render their support. Many excellent and honourable sentiments,—family affection, a desire for regular employment, respect for rank, laws, and traditions, anxieties for the future, religious habits,—all clustered round this conviction, and had often inspired its votaries with rare and trusting courage. I call these persevering supporters of Government, middle-class Tories; their defamers are weak politicians and shallow philosophers, who

neither understand the moral instincts of the soul, nor the essential interests of society.

'The *doctrinaires* have been heavily attacked. I shall endeavour to explain rather than defend them. When either men or parties have once exercised influence over events, or obtained a place in history, it becomes important that they should be correctly known; this point accomplished, they may rest in peace and submit to judgment.

'It was neither intelligence, nor talent, nor moral dignity — qualities which their acknowledged enemies have scarcely denied them — that established the original character and political importance of the *doctrinaires*.

'Other men of other parties have possessed the same qualities; and between the relative pretensions of these rivals in understanding, eloquence, and sincerity, public opinion will decide. The peculiar characteristic of the *doctrinaires*, and the real source of their importance in spite of their limited number, was that they maintained, against revolutionary principles and ideas, ideas and principles contrary to those of the old enemies of the Revolution, and with which they opposed it, not to destroy but to reform and purify it in the name of justice and truth. The great feature, dearly purchased, of the French Revolution was, that it was a work of the human mind, its conceptions and pretensions, and at the same time a struggle between social interests. Philosophy had boasted that it would regulate political economy, and that institutions, laws, and public authorities should only exist as the creatures and servants of instructed reason, — an insane pride, but a startling homage to all that is most elevated in man, to his intellectual and moral attributes! Reverses and errors were not slow in impressing on the Revolution their rough lessons; but even up to 1815 it had encountered, as commentators on its ill-fortune, none but implacable enemies or undeceived accomplices, — the first thirsting for vengeance, the last eager for rest, and neither capable of opposing to revolutionary principles anything beyond a retrograde movement on the one side, and the scepticism of weariness on the other. "There was nothing in the Revolution but error and crime," said the first; "the supporters of the old system were in the right." — "The Revolution erred only in excess," exclaimed the second; "its principles were sound, but carried too far; it has abused its rights." The *doctrinaires* denied both these conclusions; they refused to acknowledge the maxims of the old system, or, even in a mere speculative sense, to adhere to the principles of the Revolution. While frankly adopting the new state of French society, such as our entire history, and not alone the year 1789, had made it, they undertook to establish a government on rational foundations, but totally opposed to the theories in the name of which the old system had been overthrown, or the incoherent principles which some endeavoured to conjure up for its reconstruction. Alternately called on to combat and defend the Revolution, they boldly assumed from the outset an intellectual position, opposing ideas to ideas, and principles to prin-

ciples, appealing at the same time to reason and experience, affirming rights instead of maintaining interests, and requiring France, not to confess that she had committed evil alone, or to declare her impotence for good, but to emerge from the chaos into which she had plunged herself, and to raise her head once more towards Heaven in search of light.

'Let me readily admit that there was also much pride in this attempt; but a pride commencing with an act of humility, which proclaims the mistakes of yesterday with the desire and hope of not repeating them to-day. It was rendering homage to human intelligence while warning it of the limits of its power, respecting the past, without undervaluing the present or abandoning the future. It was an endeavour to bestow on politics sound philosophy, not as a sovereign mistress, but as an adviser and support.

'I shall state without hesitation, according to what experience has taught me, the faults which progressively mingled with this noble design, and impaired or checked its success. What I anxiously desire at present is to indicate its true character. It was to this mixture of philosophical sentiment and political moderation, to this rational respect for opposing rights and facts, to these principles, equally new and conservative, anti-revolutionary without being retrograde, and modest in fact although sometimes haughty in expression, that the *doctrinaires* owed their importance as well as their name. Notwithstanding the numerous errors of philosophy and human reason, the present age still cherishes reasoning and philosophical tastes; and the most determined practical politicians sometimes assume the air of acting upon general ideas, regarding them as sound methods of obtaining justification or credit. The *doctrinaires* thus responded to a profound and real necessity, although imperfectly acknowledged, of French minds: they paid equal respect to intellect and social order; their notions appeared well suited to regenerate, while terminating the Revolution. Under this double title they found, with partisans and adversaries, points of contact which drew them together, if not with active sympathy, at least with solid esteem: the right-hand party looked upon them as sincere royalists; and the left, while opposing them with acrimony, could not avoid admitting that they were neither the advocates of the old system, nor the defenders of absolute power.'

M. Guizot has invented a homely expression which very well describes this party, when he calls it a '*Toryisme bourgeois*;' but, in consideration of the high aspirations of many of those who belonged to it, it might also be termed a '*philosophical conservatism*.' We are not insensible to the weight of the arguments he has adduced in support of these opinions: but we think he overlooks several of the consequences of this very state of things, which proved in the end most fatal to the institutions the *Doctrinaires* themselves were anxious to maintain. Like all Tories, they wanted faith in the popular principles of what

professed to be a Parliamentary government. They narrowed to a sect what was designed for a nation. They created a system within which their political operations were conducted by the rules and maxims of parliamentary assemblies: but this system bore the same relation to the general movement of opinion in France, as the basin of a dock bears to the ocean: they were always floating at an artificial level. The electoral body remained, both before and after the Revolution of 1830, circumscribed within limits which admitted the upper and middle classes only to the exercise of the franchise,—a mistake the more fatal and extraordinary, because from the character of the French peasantry, and the subdivision of landed property, a constituency analogous to the old freeholders of this country might have been formed, which would certainly not have been wanting in strong conservative tendencies, and which would have connected the Parliamentary government of the monarchy with the bulk of the population. But the governing minds of France were not brought into direct contact with the people they undertook to rule. They lived too much on the abstract principles of the schools, and the gossip of the *salons* of Paris. They cared not to inquire what ‘Jacques Bonhomme’ thought of the matter, forgetting that ‘Jacques Bonhomme’ means some ten or twelve millions of Frenchmen, whose passions, interests, and habits of thought are identical throughout the country, though they may have but little in common with the wise and accomplished gentlemen who were debating laws and governments at the Palais Bourbon. In a word, they established that most precarious of all governments, when it does not rest on ancient traditions or on military force,—a government which acted in the name of the people, without consulting the people themselves.

That France had been brought by the Revolution, and by the permanent laws and institutions to which the Revolution and the Empire had given birth, into a highly democratic social condition, was, even in 1815, a self-evident fact. Social equality, the destruction of privileges, the subdivision of the soil, and the absorption of all corporate authority by the unity of the State, had become objects of passionate attachment to the great mass of the people. To undo changes so manifest was to declare war against the Revolution itself—a piece of Quixotism which was reserved for the Count d’Artois and his fanatical adherents. The question is, what was the course which political foresight prescribed to men who, like M. Guizot, were too wise to suppose that any part of the system of the ancient monarchy could be restored, and too liberal to desire to

deprive the country of those results for which it had contended so long and suffered so much. Speaking after the result, and with a knowledge of the country derived from an amount of experience which no one could then possess, we may express our conviction that these statesmen were too much afraid of the forces they themselves were labouring to direct. No doubt it was necessary to protect the young institutions of the constitutional monarchy against the passions of democracy: but would not the surest safeguard have been found in those interests of democracy which are totally distinct from the devastating impulses of revolution? For example, there is no maxim of political science more safe or more constant than that power follows land. The possession of land, though it may not always qualify men for the use of power, has a marvellous effect in restraining them from the abuse of it. The result of the convulsion of 1792 had been to break up the lands of the Church and the nobles into the small holdings of the peasantry. Far from being revolutionary in its character, this large class had become in the highest degree conservative; yet it was practically excluded from political power by the Charter which professed to establish representative government, and which might have found in that very class a broad, though not a very enlightened, support—a support infinitely more secure than that of a mock peerage, and other artificial barriers, which did, in fact, derive what little importance they possessed from the crown, and consequently could impart no independent strength to it.

M. Guizot denies that it ever formed the basis of the policy on which he acted, to establish a system of privilege in favour of the middle classes, to the exclusion of the just influence of the old nobility on the one hand, or of the people on the other; and he treats this imputation as one of the inventions of the enemies, not only of his own party, but of the constitutional monarchy itself. But the electoral law of 1817, by its high qualification, its limit of age, and other formalities, did unquestionably restrict the exercise of the franchise to a body of electors in which the middle classes preponderated. The changes this law underwent during the Restoration were all in the sense of additional limitations. The Revolution of 1830 extended it a little, but without essentially altering the class of those who returned the Deputies of the whole nation. The Revolution of 1848 was brought about, if not actually caused, by the resistance of the King and of M. Guizot's cabinet to the demand for parliamentary reform. Throughout this course of events, in which the same question reappeared under different

forms, it is impossible for us not to hold, that those who acted on this extreme dread of the popular element did, in fact, by excluding that element from the exercise of legitimate power, render it more prone to the excesses of revolution; and that, if they were at last swept away by an inundation, it was because they had dammed up the natural course of the stream.

But there were other causes, more deeply seated than the electoral law, which tended to weaken rather than to consolidate the new government. In spite of the patriotism and high character of the Duc de Richelieu, the financial ability of Baron Louis, the military organisation framed and carried into execution by Marshal St. Cyr, and the moderation of such ministers as M. Lainé and M. Decazes, even in its best years the Restoration was still a doubtful experiment. M. Guizot says, 'pourtant la Restauration était toujours en question.' He does not attribute this altogether to the unhappy condition of the royal family, restored to the throne by foreign armies more than by the voice of the people; or to the errors which may have been committed by its ministers; but rather to certain organic infirmities, under which even a more hopeful and powerful government might well have collapsed. We may here remark, that it was a fatal circumstance that the establishment of the new government should have devolved from 1815 to 1830 on princes like Louis XVIII. and Charles X., — both very old men, who belonged, by their early associations, to the pre-revolutionary period, who were the brothers of Louis XVI., who had lived twenty-five years in hostility to France and in exile, and of whom the one did not live long enough to complete his work, and the other did live long enough to destroy it.

But the true cause of the disease lay, as we believe, and as M. Guizot appears to admit, in the nature of the administrative laws and institutions which Napoleon had bequeathed to France; the Code Civil and the centralisation of government remained in full operation long after Waterloo and St. Helena had removed their great author from the scene of human affairs, and it is hardly too much to assert that they have avenged him. The result has proved how difficult a task it was to establish and to extend the practice of free government in France, when laws and usages of primary influence on social life were steadily continuing the work that despotism had begun.

'A natural and important disagreement exists between the representative government, instituted by the Charter, and the administrative monarchy founded by Louis XIV. and Napoleon. Where

administration and policy are equally free, when local affairs are discussed and decided by local authorities or influences, and neither derive their impulse nor solution from the central power, which never interferes except when the general interest of the State absolutely requires it to do so,—as in England, and in the United States of America, in Holland and Belgium, for instances,—the representative system readily accords with an administrative Government which never appeals to its co-operation except on important and rare occasions. But when the supreme authority undertakes at the same time to govern with freedom, and to administer by centralisation,—when it has to contend, at the seat of power, for the great affairs of the State, and to regulate, under its own responsibility, in all the departments, the minor business of every district,—two weighty objections immediately present themselves: either the central power, absorbed by the care of national questions, and occupied with its own defence, neglects local affairs, and suffers them to fall into disorder and inaction; or it connects them closely with general questions, making them subservient to its own interests; and thus the whole system of administration, from the hamlet to the palace, degenerates into an implement of government in the hands of political parties who are mutually contending for power.

‘I am certainly not called upon to-day to dwell on this evil; it has become the hackneyed theme of the adversaries of representative government, and of political liberty. It was felt long before it was taken advantage of; but instead of employing it against free institutions, an attempt was made to effect its cure. To achieve this end, a double work was to be accomplished; it was necessary to infuse liberty into the administration of local affairs, and to second the development of the local forces capable of exercising authority within their own circle. An aristocracy cannot be created by laws, either at the extremities or at the fountain-head of the State; but the most democratic society is not stripped of natural powers ready to display themselves when called into action. Not only in the departments, but in the divisions, in the townships and villages, landed property, industry, employments, professions, and traditions have their local influences, which, if adopted and organised with prudence, constitute effectual authority. From 1816 to 1848, under each of the two constitutional monarchies, whether voluntarily or by compulsion, the different cabinets have acted under this conviction; they have studied to relieve the central Government, by remitting a portion of its functions, sometimes to the regular local agents, and at others to more independent auxiliaries. But, as it too often happens, the remedy was not rapid enough in operation; mistrust, timidity, inexperience, and routine slackened its progress; neither the authorities nor the people knew how to employ it with resolution, or to wait the results with patience. Thus compelled to sustain the burden of political liberty with that of administrative centralisation, the newly born constitutional monarchy found itself compromised between difficulties and contradictory responsibilities, exceeding the measure of ability and strength which could be reasonably expected from any Government.’

These general considerations, which may be traced by their effects from the commencement to the end of the Parliamentary government of France, appear to us to contain the whole lesson which posterity will care to learn or to retain from that period. They are of interest, for they concern not only the past, but the future welfare of a great nation; but we confess our inability to derive either amusement or instruction from the declamatory egotism with which M. de Châteaubriand has recorded his share in the government of the time; or in the new unmeaning combinations which were supposed to have so much more importance than they actually possessed.

Amongst the political personages of that epoch, the most important figure is unquestionably that of M. de Villèle; and to his administration M. Guizot has done greater justice than this Minister has met with before, especially at the hands of those who were opposed to him. From 1822 to 1827, M. de Villèle succeeded, with the support of the Right Centre in the Chambers, first in prolonging the authority of Louis XVIII., and secondly, in resisting the reactionary designs of Charles X. 'He was not,' says M. Guizot, 'one of those men of energetic convictions and determined will who are so essential in the great transformations of human society. He had common sense without genius, and ability without transcendent power.' On taking office, he said, 'Je suis né pour la fin des révolutions;' but unhappily the Revolution was much less near its end than he imagined, and the sparks he was endeavouring to put down served ere long to rekindle the conflagration. The consequence was, that he was open to attacks on both sides, and eventually fell unregretted by the people and unsupported by the King. The Duchess d'Angoulême judged more correctly of his worth when she said to Charles X., 'In abandoning M. de Villèle, you are descending the first step of your throne.'

In 1820 M. Guizot was leading a simple and retired life at *Isa Maisonnète*, a small country-house, which had been lent him by Madame de Condorcet, about twenty miles from Paris, commanding a long stretch of the pastures and poplars of the cheerful valley of the Seine. He was still not of age to enter the Chamber which was to be the scene of his greatest political triumphs. The reactionary policy of the Cabinet had caused him to withdraw from the office he held in the *Conseil d'Etat*. He proceeded to devote his leisure to the duties of his Chair of Modern History, interspersed with the production of three or four pamphlets on the political tendencies of the day. But the real preparation for his future eminence, both as an orator and as a statesman, undoubtedly lay in that remarkable course

of lectures which commenced on the 7th December, 1820, and which still remains the noblest production of his intellect. The description given in this present volume of the spirit and intention of these lectures is extremely interesting.

‘I selected for the subject of my course the history of the old political institutions of Christian Europe, and of the origin of representative government, in the different forms in which it had been formerly attempted, with or without success. I touched very closely, in such a subject, on the flagrant embarrassments of that contemporaneous policy to which I was determined to make no allusion. But I also found an obvious opportunity of carrying out, through scientific paths alone, the double object I had in view. I was anxious to combat revolutionary theories, and to attach interest and respect to the past history of France. We had scarcely emerged from the most furious struggle against that old French society, our secular cradle; our hearts, if not still overflowing with anger, were indifferent towards it, and our minds were confusedly imbued with the ideas, true or false, under which it had fallen. The time had come for clearing out that arena covered with ruins, and for substituting, in thought as in fact, equity for hostility, and the principles of liberty for the arms of the Revolution. An edifice is not built with machines of war; neither can a free system be founded on ignorant prejudices and inveterate antipathies. I encountered, at every step throughout my course, the great problems of social organisation, under the name of which parties and classes exchanged such heavy blows,—the sovereignty of the people and the right divine of kings, monarchy and republicanism, aristocracy and democracy, the unity or division of power, the various systems of election, constitution, and action of the assemblies called to co-operate in government. I entered upon all these questions with a firm determination to sift thoroughly the ideas of our own time, and to separate revolutionary excitement and fantasies from the advances of justice and liberty, reconcilable with the eternal laws of social order. By the side of this philosophic undertaking, I pursued another, exclusively historical; I endeavoured to demonstrate the intermitting but always recurring efforts of French society to emerge from the violent chaos in which it had been originally formed, sometimes produced by the conflict, and at others by the accordance of its different elements—royalty, nobility, clergy, citizens, and people,—throughout the different phases of that harsh destiny, and the glorious although incomplete development of French civilisation, such as the Revolution had compiled it after so many combats and vicissitudes. I particularly wished to associate old France with the remembrance and intelligence of new generations; for there was as little sense as justice in decrying or despising our fathers, at the very moment when, equally misled in our time, we were taking an immense step in the same path which they had followed for so many ages.’

For nearly two years this course of historical and political inquiry continued to throw extraordinary lustre over the schools of Paris, and to educate the most powerful minds of the rising generation. So little, however, was the government capable of understanding the true bearing of M. Guizot's character and opinions, that in October, 1822, the Abbé Frayssinous, then Grand-Master of the University, suspended the lecturer and stopped the course. Under the ministry of M. Martignac the course was again opened, from 1828 to 1830, with undiminished success, and it was from his chair in the Sorbonne that M. Guizot, already recognised as one of the most eminent men of the liberal party, which reckoned the whole intelligence of France in its ranks, was carried triumphantly to the legislature by the electors of Lisieux, in the department of Calvados—those faithful adherents whose political connexion with M. Guizot was only interrupted by the catastrophe of 1848. This event took place but a few weeks after the formation of the cabinet of Prince Polignac, so that M. Guizot's formal entry into parliamentary life coincided with the commencement of the memorable struggle in which Charles X. threw away his crown. It was one of the strangest provisions of the Charter of 1814, that until the age of forty no man could sit in the Chamber of Deputies, as if the government of the country could be carried on in permanent disregard of the wishes and opinions of the younger and more active part of the community. But in this, as in other respects, the fallacy prevailed that opposition was less to be dreaded beyond the walls of the Legislature than within them. To M. Guizot, however, the interval was a fortunate one. It relieved him from taking an active part in the disheartening contests of the Restoration; it enabled him to devote the strength of his manhood to the study of the history and institutions of England, which then first became to him an object of great interest and regard; and it threw him at last fully armed into the arena. The crisis which was about to call him into action was at hand, though its full gravity was scarcely perceived even by those who were already in the rapids of the cataract. As late as the 12th July hopes were still entertained that Charles X. would not proceed to the last extremities, but would bend to the will of the nation constitutionally expressed, and the real object of the best and most enlightened members of the opposition was certainly not to overthrow the monarchy, or to effect a revolution, but to restrain the King from the fatal course which led to his own destruction:

'I do not pretend to assert that these were the sentiments

of all those who, whether in the Chambers or in the country, had approved the Address of the Two Hundred and Twenty-one, and who, at the elections, voted for its support. The Restoration had not achieved such complete conquests in France. Inactive, but not resigned, the secret societies were ever in existence; ready, when opportunity occurred, to resume their work of conspiracy and destruction. Other adversaries, more legitimate but not less formidable, narrowly watched every mistake of the King and his Government, and sedulously brought them under public comment, expecting and prognosticating still more serious errors, which would lead to extreme consequences. Amongst the popular masses, a deeply rooted instinct of suspicion and hatred to all that recalled the old system and the invasion of the foreigners, continued to supply arms and inexhaustible hopes to the enemies of the Restoration. The people resemble the ocean, motionless and almost immutable at the bottom, however violent may be the storms which agitate the surface. Nevertheless, the spirit of legality and sound political reason had made remarkable progress; even during the ferment of the elections, public feeling loudly repudiated all idea of a new revolution. Never was the situation of those who sincerely wished to support the King and the Charter more favourable or powerful; they had given evidences of persevering firmness by legitimate opposition, they had lately maintained with reputation the principles of representative government, they enjoyed the esteem and even the favour of the public; the more violent party, through necessity, and the country, with some hesitation, mingled with honest hope, followed in their rear. If at this critical moment they could have succeeded with the King as with the Chambers and the country,—if Charles X., after having by the dissolution pushed his royal prerogative to the extreme verge, had listened to the strongly manifested wishes of France, and selected his advisers from amongst those of the constitutional Royalists who stood the highest in public consideration, I say, with a feeling of conviction which may appear foolhardy, but which I maintain to this hour, that there was every reasonable hope of surmounting the last decisive trial; and that the country taking confidence at once in the King and in the Charter, the Restoration and constitutional government would have been established together.

‘But the precise quality in which Charles X. was deficient,’ was that expansive freedom of mind which conveys to a monarch a perfect intelligence of the age in which he lives, and endows him with a sound appreciation of its resources and necessities. “There are only M. de La Fayette and I who have not changed since 1789,” said he, one day; and he spoke truly. Through all the vicissitudes of his life he ever remained what his youthful training had made him at the Court of Versailles and in the aristocratic society of the eighteenth century—sincere and light, confident in himself and in his own immediate circle, unobservant and irreflective, although of an active spirit, attached to his ideas and his friends of the old system as to his faith and his standard. Under the reign of his brother Louis XVIII., and during the scission of the monarchical party, he

became the patron and hope of that Royalist opposition which boldly availed itself of constitutional liberties, and presented in his own person a singular mixture of persevering intimacy with his old companions, and of a taste for the new popularity of a Liberal. When he found himself on the throne, he made more than one coquettish advance to this popular disposition, and sincerely flattered himself that he governed according to the Charter, with his old friends and his ideas of earlier times. M. de Villèle and M. de Martignac lent themselves to his views in this difficult work; and after their fall, which he scarcely opposed, Charles X. found himself left to his natural tendencies, in the midst of advisers little disposed to contradict, and without the power of restraining him. Two fatal mistakes then established themselves in his mind; he fancied that he was menaced by the Revolution, much more than was really the fact; and he ceased to believe in the possibility of defending himself, and of governing by the legal course of the constitutional system. France had no desire for a new revolution. The Charter contained, for a prudent and patient monarch, certain means of exercising the royal authority and of securing the Crown. But Charles X. had lost confidence in France and in the Charter. When the Address of the Two Hundred and Twenty-one deputies came triumphant through the elections, he believed that he was driven to his last entrenchment, and reduced to save himself without the Charter, or to perish by a revolution.

‘A few days before the Decrees of July, the Russian Ambassador, Count Pozzo di Borgo, had an audience of the King. He found him seated before his desk, with his eyes fixed on the Charter, opened at Article 14. Charles X. read and re-read that article, seeking with honest anxiety the interpretation he wanted to find there. In such cases, we always discover what we are in search of; and the King’s conversation, although indirect and uncertain, left little doubts on the Ambassador’s mind as to the measures in preparation.’

At this point the present volume abruptly terminates. It closes at the moment when M. Guizot himself became, as a Minister of the Crown, one of the founders of that monarchy, on the popular and constitutional basis of the Charter of 1830, to whose service the remainder of his public life was devoted. The succeeding portions of these Memoirs will therefore acquire an interest which this introduction can scarcely be said to possess. Thus far M. Guizot has written chiefly as an intelligent spectator of the events of his age; but from the Revolution of July he became one of the chief personages of the drama, and he will speak with the authority of a statesman thoroughly conversant with the whole policy of the ensuing reign. §

- ART. V.—1. *Contributions to the Physiology of Vision. Part I. On some remarkable and hitherto unobserved Phenomena of Binocular Vision.* By CHARLES WHEATSTONE, F.R.S. Philos. Transact. 1838.
2. *Contributions to the Physiology of Vision. Part II.* By CHARLES WHEATSTONE, F.R.S. Philos. Transact. 1852.
3. *The Stereoscope; its History, Theory, and Construction, with its Application to the Fine and Useful Arts, and to Education.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S., M.R.I.A. London: 1856.
4. *Observations on Binocular Vision.* By Prof. WILLIAM B. ROGERS. From the American Journal of Science and Arts, 1855.
5. *Essai sur les Phosphènes, ou Anneaux Lumineux de la Rétine, considérés dans leurs rapports avec la Physiologie et la Pathologie de la Vision.* Par le Dr. SERRE, d'Uzès. Paris: 1853.
6. *Recherches sur la Vision Binoculaire, Simple et Double, et sur les Conditions Physiologiques du Relief.* Par le Dr. SERRE, d'Uzès. Bruxelles: 1856.
7. *On the Phenomena and Mechanism of the Focal Adjustment of the Eye to distinct Vision at different Distances.* By Prof. ALLEN THOMSON, M.D., F.R.S.S.L. & E. Glasgow: 1857.
8. *On the Phenomena of Relief in the Image formed on the Ground Glass of the Camera Obscura.* By A. CLAUDET, F.R.S. From the Proceedings of the Royal Society: June 18. 1857.
9. *On the Stereomonoscope: a new Instrument by which an apparently Single Picture produces the Stereoscopic Illusion.* By A. CLAUDET, F.R.S. From the Proceedings of the Royal Society: April 15. 1858.

WHY, having two eyes, we ordinarily see the objects around us not double but single, is a question which most persons of ordinary intelligence have asked themselves at one time or another. Why, the picture on the retina being inverted, our vision is nevertheless erect, is an inquiry that naturally occurs to every one who is acquainted with the optical fact of the inversion. But why, the two retinal pictures of any solid body within a moderate distance of the eyes, being sensibly different, we are not only unembarrassed by that difference, but gain a

much more complete and certain conception of the shape of that body than we can acquire by the use of either eye singly, — is a consideration which, obvious as is its importance when once suggested, seems to have presented itself to comparatively few persons, and never to have been seriously examined until it was taken up by Mr. Wheatstone about twenty-five years ago.

These three problems are more closely linked together than at first view they seem to be. They all belong to that border-region between the corporeal and the mental, the physiological and the psychical, which has ever been most fertile in controversy; one party contending for the sufficiency of physical explanations, whilst the other affirms that their solution lies altogether within the domain of metaphysics, neither optics nor physiology having anything to do with it. Thus it has come to pass that one set of philosophers has reasoned upon the phenomena of vision, as if the retinal picture formed by the optical instrumentality of the eye were daguerreotyped (so to speak) on the mind, just as the photographer transfers the picture obtained by his camera from one 'sensitive surface' to another: whilst another set has gone so far as to deny that we have any true idea either of the relative places or of the actual forms of objects, save what we acquire from the combination of tactile with visual experience, and to affirm that the infant really does see objects inverted until he has learned the truth by handling them.

The researches of Professor Wheatstone on the Physiology of Binocular Vision have added so much to our knowledge of this subject, not only by what they have themselves proved, but also by the inquiries which they have suggested to other investigators, that it has come to present itself under an aspect in many respects new; and not only can tolerably definite answers be now given to each of the questions we have just propounded, but the relative shares of the eye and the mind, of the optical instrument and the conscious interpreter of its indications, can be pretty clearly marked out. The invention of the Stereoscope, Professor Wheatstone's claim to which we regard as altogether incontestable, was not the result of accident, but the product of a train of sagacious reasoning; and whilst for that more recent modification of the instrument which has led to its wide-spread and still increasing popularity we are indebted to the ingenuity of others, its philosophic originator, leaving its practical applications to be developed by such as care to turn them to pecuniary account, has confined himself to the pursuit of the scientific inquiries out of which his invention arose. In the course of these inquiries, he has been led not merely to the

introduction of very important modifications into his original form of the stereoscope, by which the sources of our appreciation of magnitude and distance may be submitted to experimental tests; but also to the invention of an entirely new instrument, the Pseudoscope, the use of which furnishes an unequivocal demonstration that the share of the mind in the interpretation of visual impressions is far greater than those who hold that vision is to be explained on optical principles alone have been ready to admit.

The value of Professor Wheatstone's researches upon Binocular vision, however, will be best appreciated, if we first obtain a clear understanding of what Monocular vision, or vision with a single eye, *can* and *cannot* do; and the pursuit of this preliminary inquiry will give us an opportunity of noticing in their most appropriate place the highly interesting results of two sets of recent experimental investigations, the one directed to the determination of the mode in which the *focal adjustment* of the eye is effected, the other to the source of our *appreciation of the direction* of the objects which produce their pictorial impressions upon the retina.

Whilst the marvellous perfection of the eye as an optical instrument has come to be more and more appreciated with every advance in our knowledge of its action, the source of that perfection in one of its most important adjustments has until lately been an open question among physiologists. Every one who has handled a telescope well knows that if, after its focus has been so adjusted as to give a distinct image of a remote object, he directs the instrument to one much nearer, the image of the latter is indistinct until a re-adjustment has been made by drawing out the tube so as to increase the distance between the object-glass and the eye; whilst, conversely, if, after making such re-adjustment for the near object, he turns his telescope back to the remote one, he finds the image of the latter to be indistinct, until the tube has been shortened again so as to bring the object-glass to its former distance from the eye. And it is possible, within certain limits, to deduce from the amount of the alteration required in each case, an approximative estimate of the distance of the object. Now every person who possesses ordinarily good sight has a wide range of distinct vision; being able to see objects with equal clearness (allowance being made for their difference of apparent size, and for atmospheric interference) whether they be placed at eight inches, at eight feet, at eight yards, or at eight miles from his eye. That this range can only be obtained by a special adjustment of the organ for each distance, is not merely a theoretical surmise, but may be

readily demonstrated by experiments so simple that we need scarcely describe them. And these experiments further show that the adjustment is made *automatically*, as the direct result of the determinate fixation of the attention on a particular object; but the change is felt to involve a certain effort, which is greater when the adjustment is made for a near than for a distant object, and which increases considerably as the object is brought closer and closer to the eye.

Various hypotheses have been offered as to the mode in which this adjustment is effected. Some have thought that the form of the eye as a whole is altered by muscular pressure, so that its axis is lengthened or shortened. Others have maintained that the distance between the crystalline lens and the retina is altered by a change of place produced in the former by a muscular apparatus within the eye. And others have attributed the result to an alteration in the curvature of the lens itself. Until recently, the second of these suppositions has been the one most generally favoured; but the last, improbable as it seems *à priori*, would now appear to be the true one. For Professor Helmholtz (whose researches on this point have been confirmed by Professor Allen Thomson, of Glasgow), by carefully observing the images of bright objects reflected from the anterior and posterior surfaces of the lens, when the eye had been made to adjust itself in succession for near and for distant objects, has shown that these images undergo a change in size and relative position, for which nothing but an *alteration in the curvature of the lens* can account. The convexity of its anterior surface is greatly augmented, the part of the iris that immediately surrounds the pupil being even pushed forwards, when the refractive power of the eye needs to be increased, so as to bring the highly diverging rays proceeding from a near object to a focus on the retina; and this convexity is proportionally diminished when the removal of the object to a distance causes the rays received from it by the eye to approximate more closely to parallelism. This automatic alteration in the curvature of the lens is one of the most marvellous pieces of self-adjustment that the human organism with all its wondrous mechanism can furnish. Let any optician set himself to devise a means of imitating it, by causing the tube of his telescope to alter its length, or the lenses to change their curvature, without any interference on the part of the observer, whenever the instrument is turned from one object to another at a different distance; and he will soon give up the solution of the problem as hopeless. What the structural arrangement is by which the alteration in the curvature of the crystalline lens is effected, still remains to be discovered; it is obviously a great

step, however, to have gained a clear idea of what to look for; since, until the nature of the change was certainly known, the physiologist who might attempt to trace out its source was truly groping in the dark.

By that combination of refractive media of different densities, and by that arrangement of the curvatures of their respective surfaces, which the optician essays to imitate in the construction of achromatic object-glasses for the telescope and microscope,—as well as by the power of self-adjustment to variations of distance,—it comes to pass that the eye is rendered capable of forming on the retina a picture of any object to which it is directed within the range of distinct vision, far exceeding in perfection that which the most elaborate instrument constructed by human ingenuity could present. The more carefully we scrutinise the details of this picture, the higher must our admiration rise of its marvellous exactness. As Paley says, the whole of an extended landscape shall be brought within the area of a sixpence; and yet every detail that presents a sensible magnitude shall be distinctly perceived. It is to be remarked, however, that the distinctness of the visual perception is by no means uniform over the several parts of the field of view. That portion towards which the axis of the eye is directed, is alone discerned with satisfactory clearness; all save this is but vaguely seen. Let the reader, closing one eye, fix the other upon any word in the centre of the printed page before him, and he will perhaps be surprised to find how small is the number of other words which he can read without altering the position of his visual organ,—probably no more than a word in the line above, and another in the line below, all three lying within the area of a fourpenny-piece. Still, although *perfectly distinct* vision is thus limited to a small space, the mind can take cognizance of the larger features of the visual picture over a much wider area; thus, keeping the eye steadily fixed upon the central word of the page, we can distinguish the lines of print over its whole surface, the form of the book, its place upon the table, the position of the table in the room and that of other pieces of furniture; and we thus gain a general idea of the nature and relations of surrounding objects, which we can complete whenever we choose by a more detailed survey. In making this survey, we direct the axis of the eye to every part of the field in succession; and thus are enabled to discern each feature with perfect distinctness, without losing cognizance of its relations to the rest.

Some physiologists have maintained that our appreciation of the relative positions of objects is derived through an intuitive

interpretation of the muscular sensations experienced in changing the direction of the eye from one point to another. But this view is inconsistent with the fact that we obtain at the very first glance a no less definite idea of the relative positions, not only of such objects as lie within the small area of distinct vision, but of such as we can adequately distinguish in the parts of the field outside this, than we subsequently acquire by the most detailed survey. Without such guiding sensations, indeed, we should not be able to direct the movements of our eyes in making that survey. And it has of late been generally admitted that, in some way or other, we are intuitively guided in our cognizance of the directions of objects, by the relation which the corresponding points of their retinal picture bear to some point in the interior of the eye. The recent researches of Dr. Serre on the luminous spectra, or *phosphènes*, which are produced by making pressure on the eye when external light is excluded, appear to have demonstrated that we intuitively perceive the several parts of an object in 'lines of direction' drawn from the corresponding parts of its retinal image through a point that lies a little behind the centre of the crystalline lens; and the 'centre of direction,' thus experimentally determined, corresponds with that through which it has been theoretically shown by Volkmann (who has projected the course of the rays through the eye according to the known curvatures and refractive powers of its different humors) that the axial rays of all the visual pencils cross one another.

It would be premature to affirm that this intuitive projection can be referred to any material conditions lying still further back; but we should scarcely do justice to Dr. Serre were we not to mention his ingenious speculation, that it is determined by the disposition of the peculiar 'rods' of which the thickness of the retina is well known to be chiefly made up; these rods, according to him, all pointing towards the 'centre of direction.'

Of the relative *directions* of the objects and parts of objects before us, therefore, and consequently of their relative angular positions (that is, of the places they would have in a perspective projection), we gain an exact knowledge by the use of one eye alone; and where great precision is required, we find it desirable to limit ourselves to the use of a single eye, and to exclude the action of the other, either by closing its lid, or by withdrawing our attention from the images it presents. Thus, the sportsman taking aim at his bird, the archer pointing his arrow at the bull's-eye, or the carpenter looking along the edge he is planing to ascertain if it be 'true,' instinctively uses but one eye, since he would find himself perplexed rather

than assisted by the discrepancy between the lines of direction proceeding from two different points of sight.

The case is very different, however, with respect to relative distances, which we have no certain power of appreciating except by the conjoint use of both eyes; though even this only enables us to distinguish differences of distance within moderate limits. It is not a little singular how few are aware, save those who have studied the subject scientifically, of the degree in which we habitually depend upon binocular vision for the guidance of all such movements as require an exact estimate of the respective degrees of proximity of two or more objects. In the simple acts of snuffing a candle or threading a needle, its guidance is so necessary, that the chances are large against either of them being successfully performed, until after many unsuccessful trials, when one eye is closed. A very good test-experiment is to suspend a curtain ring in such a manner as to present its edge at the distance of four or five feet from the eye; and then to try to push sideways through its hoop the curved handle of a walking-stick held by the lower end; in this feat, which can be readily accomplished under the guidance of binocular vision, large odds may be laid that success will not be attained when one eye is closed, until a succession of trials shall have enabled the experimenter to measure the distance of the ring by the muscular movements of his arm.

How the conjoint use of two eyes enables us to measure distances which we cannot certainly estimate by either singly, is a question that is, perhaps, not yet altogether settled. The ordinary solution of it is, that as the axes of the eyes are made to converge upon any point at which we look, and as the degree of convergence becomes greater and greater in proportion to the approximation of the point to the eye, whilst it diminishes in proportion as the point is removed, until at a certain distance the axes become virtually parallel, we base our estimate on the indications afforded by the muscular sensation, which we experience whenever the angle of convergence is altered in the change of direction of the eyes from one object to another. But though this may be true, we do not think that it is the whole truth; for it does not apply to all objects but those at which we directly look; and it seems to us that we have a power of estimating the relative distances of all the objects that we can perceive at any one moment, quite irrespective of the amount of convergence of our optic axes upon them. And this appreciation may not improbably be based on the information which we derive as to the actual places of near objects from the dissimilarity of the 'lines of direction' in which they are seen by

the two eyes. For whilst the axes of the eyes meet in any point on which their gaze is turned, the 'lines of direction' of all other objects that are visible at the same time, will meet in those objects respectively. And thus, as the bee-hunter finds the hive of which he is in search, by running together the lines of flight of two bees which he sets free from different points, so, as it appears to us, do we mentally combine these two different lines of direction; thus forming an estimate of the distances of objects more or less removed from the centre of the field, which, however vague and imperfect in itself, is of essential use in helping us to a correct idea of the relations of the whole.

The like holds good in regard to that estimation of the relative distances of the different parts of objects, which is necessary to the correct appreciation of their solid forms. The image projected on the retina of a single eye, being a *picture* merely, cannot of itself give rise to any conviction of solidity in the mind. (It will be remembered that Cheselden's celebrated patient was some time before he could distinguish pictures from the objects they represented; not because the pictures looked solid, but because everything around him seemed flat.) For our interpretation of the meaning of its different forms and colours, of its lights and shadows, we are dependent upon our previous knowledge of the objects it represents, or of others analogous to them, derived through the sense of touch. That this general statement, known as the *Berkeleyan Theory of Vision*, is unquestionably true of vision with a single eye, though it requires modification in its application to vision with both eyes, has been convincingly shown by recent inquiries into the capabilities of *monocular* as compared with *binocular* vision; which prove that as from the former alone (so long, at least, as we keep the eye in one place) we can gain no definite appreciation of the relative distances either of different objects or of different parts of the same object, we are entirely unable to do more than guess at their solid forms, of which we may be led to an entirely erroneous conception, especially if our interpretation should be made under the influence of any previous mental impression.

It has long been known that when a seal is looked at through a microscope, it will appear sometimes projecting as a cameo, sometimes excavated as an *intaglio*; and this 'conversion of relief' (as it is appropriately termed by Professor Wheatstone) may be effected either upon the engraved stone or upon its waxen impression. That it is due, not (as some have supposed) to an optical change effected by the microscope, but simply to the limitation of the visual impression to a single eye, which deprives the

judgment of the positive guidance whereon it ordinarily relies, is clearly proved by the fact that no such conversion can be produced under a properly constructed binocular microscope,—a seal, like every other object, being represented in its true projection; whilst it is readily effected in regard to larger objects of a suitable nature, without the intervention of any optical instrument. Thus, as Sir D. Brewster pointed out in his '*Natural Magic*,' if we take the intaglio mould of a bas-relief, and look steadily on it for a time with one eye, excluding surrounding objects as much as possible from our attention, we may distinctly see the bas-relief as if projecting. 'After a little practice,' he says, 'I have succeeded in raising a complete hollow mask of the human face, the size of life, into a projecting head.' We have found the large scallop-shell made in tin, which is used as a dish for serving-up scalloped oysters, an extremely good subject for this experiment; for when its surface has been sufficiently dulled to prevent the effect being interfered with by reflection, and it is held up at the distance of three or four feet, with the light falling full upon it so as to avoid shadow, we find it impossible to say with confidence, when looking at it with a single eye, whether it is the convex or the concave side that is turned towards us.

The facility with which these conversions, and others of like nature, occur to the 'mind's eye,' may be readily shown to depend upon the degree of readiness with which, in virtue of our previous habits and experiences, the visual picture suggests the real form or its converse. In the case of a seal or of a bas-relief, the hollow mould and its projecting cast are objects almost equally familiar; and the two sides of the tin shell, which are the precise reflexes of each other, are mentally apprehended with equal readiness; hence the representation of either may offer itself, and the one may be substituted for the other by a slight effort of the volitional power of conception. The conversion of the hollow mask into the projecting face is, to most persons, still more easy, because they are more accustomed to the life-like features of the plaster model, than they are to the concave mould which has no similitude in nature; whilst, on the other hand, we have not found it possible, either in our own experience or in that of any one else, to convert the face of a bust into the likeness of a hollow mask by the simple monocular gaze, however long continued, even with the aid of the strongest effort of imagination. The result of the experiment, however, will be remarkably affected by a slight modification in the manner of making it. Instead of a plaster mould, take a common pasteboard mask (such as is sold in every toy-

shop), of which the thickness is so uniform throughout that each surface is an almost exact reflex of the other; and paint the inside, which is usually left in the rough, so that the colours of its different parts may imitate, as closely as possible, those of the corresponding parts of its exterior. If the inside or hollow surface of the mask be then held at arm's length from the eye, and the light be so arranged that no shadow falls anywhere upon it, not only will the image of the projecting face very readily present itself, but it will be difficult for an observer who has once caught this to see the mask as it really is, even by a determinate effort. The illusion is the more complete, if his view be limited to the mask itself, and he be brought to the proper point of sight without being aware of what he is to see; so that, of a large number of persons on whom we have tried this experiment, almost all have at once pronounced that they were looking at the projecting surface of the mask, and have only been convinced to the contrary by the conjoint use of both eyes. That the colour here aids the illusion, by giving to the image more of the aspect with which experience has made us familiar, becomes obvious by the difference of result when the same experiment is tried with a pasteboard mask whose interior has been left in its original condition; for the conversion is then far less readily made in the first instance; and, when the image of the projecting face in rough brown pasteboard has once presented itself, it more readily gives place to the representation of the reality. But again, let the experimenter familiarise himself thoroughly with the aspect of the painted interior of such a mask as seen with both eyes, and then, turning the exterior towards him, let him gaze steadily at it with one eye; he will probably be able to effect that conversion with the mask which he could not with the bust, so as to succeed in seeing the hollowed reverse with which his consciousness has just before been impressed, whilst he is actually looking at the projecting face.*

Another singularly interesting demonstration of the inability of monocular vision to afford any true idea of solid form, was given by Professor Wheatstone in the first of his two remarkable memoirs. If we hold up at arm's length a small skeleton cube made of wire or ebony-beading, and look at it with one eye whilst placing it in a variety of positions by turning it

* This last experiment will be more certainly successful when the conversion has been previously made by the Pseudoscope (see p. 459.); a more precise conversion of the exterior being obtained by its means, than is afforded by the visual image of the interior.

between the fingers, so long as the mind perceives the cube, its various perspective projections are interpreted by it as so many different representations of one object, all of them suggesting the same primitive form. But as certain of these perspective projections might be given by an object of very different shape, it will probably happen that in some position of the cube one of these dissimilar figures will suggest itself to the mind; and, if this new conception be fixed by a steady gaze for a short time, it will take such possession of the mind that some effort is required to bring back the original conception,—so long, that is, as the position of the cube remains unchanged. But if, whilst the mind is thus possessed with the false idea, the cube be again made to turn between the fingers, the series of successive projections then presented not being reconcilable with the converse form, either the mind reverts to the original conception of the cube as the only one with which they are consistent, or (if this should not be adopted) the skeleton figure seems to be continually undergoing a change of shape, as if its sides were hinged together and fell into new inclinations with every new position given to the object.

So far is the disposition of the lights and shadows on the surface of the object from being the source (as some have maintained) of these ‘conversions of relief,’ that we have found strong shadows to exert a positive interference whenever the eye alone is used; causing the conversion to take place far less readily, or even preventing it altogether, unless the observer be deceived or at least kept in ignorance as to the real source of the light. Thus if, when he is looking at the interior of a mask, a strong shadow be thrown by light which he knows to come from his right hand, he feels this shadow to be so incompatible with the idea of a projecting face, that his mind cannot adopt the suggestion which would otherwise take possession of it. This does not happen, however, if the source of the light be concealed from the observer, since he may then reconcile the shadow with the idea of a projecting face on which light is thrown from the other side. But if the illumination be so arranged, that the light appears to proceed from a source on the left hand, whilst the shadows are really thrown from the right, the illusion may be increased in vividness, since the mind then finds it more difficult to revert to the true conception. So again, when a seal is looked at in a microscope, or larger objects of the same kind are seen through an inverting telescope, the ‘conversion of relief’ is doubtless aided by the fact that the optical inversion of the images has caused the relation of the shadows to the known source of the light to be also reversed, so

that they fall as they would do if the cameo were really replaced by the intaglio, or the intaglio by the cameo. But so far from this illusion being 'the result (as affirmed by Sir D. Brewster) of an operation of our own minds, whereby we judge of the forms of bodies by the knowledge we have acquired of light and shadow,' it is totally independent of *chiaroscuro*, and may be most completely produced when the greatest care has been taken to secure a uniform illumination. It depends, as we think we must have sufficiently shown, on the tendency of the mind to interpret the picture received through the eye, according to its previous familiarity with the solid forms which that picture may represent; its choice between two or more of these being quite involuntary when one is decidedly more familiar to the mind than another, but being to a certain extent under volitional control when they present themselves with equal or nearly equal readiness, the will having the power of fixing the attention upon the one to the exclusion of the others.

From the want of power to distinguish solid form with certainty when one eye alone is employed, a curious result proceeds, which seems at first sight inconsistent with that we have been just considering, though not at all so in reality. It has long been known that if we gaze steadily at a picture whose perspective projection, lights and shadows, and general arrangement of details, are such as accurately correspond with the real scene which is the subject of it, the impression of that scene will be much more vivid when we look with one eye only, than when we use both; and that the effect will be further heightened when we carefully shut out the surroundings of the picture, by looking through a tube of appropriate size and shape. This fact has been commonly accounted for in a very erroneous manner. 'We see more exquisitely,' says Lord Bacon, 'with one eye than with both, because the vital spirits thus unite themselves the more and become the stronger;' and other writers, though in different language, agree with Bacon in attributing the result to the concentration of the visual power when one eye is used to the exclusion of the other. But the fact is, that when we look with both eyes at a picture within a moderate distance, we are forced (for reasons which will presently appear) to recognise it as a flat surface; but when we look with only one, our minds are at liberty to be acted on by the suggestions furnished by the perspective, *chiaroscuro*, &c.; so that after we have gazed for a little time, the picture may begin to start into relief, and may even come to possess the solidity of a model. The completeness of this illusion will essentially depend upon the exactness with which

the picture represents the real projection of its object upon a flat surface. It is very rarely that pictures painted by human hands 'come out' after this fashion in a degree at all comparable to sun-pictures, for the obvious reason that the photograph represents not merely the actual perspective of the scene or object, but the actual chiaroscuro as it is at any one moment, with a fidelity which the artist who requires *time* for his work, cannot possibly equal, since the shadows of the object are so constantly changing as he proceeds, that he can scarcely by any possibility avoid a departure from strict truth in his combinations. We have before us at this moment three photographs, two of bassi-relievi, and one of an alto-relievo, by Lucca della Robbia, which, when looked at with one eye in the manner we have described, give rise to a feeling of projection so vivid, that it is almost impossible not to credit it. As the shadows are strong in all these photographs, the illusion is promoted by causing the light by which they are viewed to fall on them in the direction corresponding to that in which it fell on the originals, when (so to speak) they sat to the photographic camera for their portraits; but this is by no means a necessary condition, the effect being produced with nearly the same vividness in diffused daylight. If, indeed, a strong light be seen to proceed from the opposite side, so that the direction of the shadows in the photograph is reversed with reference to it, the picture may be turned (as it were) inside out, so as no longer to present the rilievo, but its hollow mould. This conversion we can produce most effectively with a beautiful photograph of a large American trilobite imbedded in its rocky matrix; for according to the direction in which the light is allowed to fall upon it, with some aid from the determining power of the will, the surface of the back of the trilobite appears to project, or it may be turned into a concave reverse representing the 'cast' of that surface in the surrounding rock.*

So great an improvement, indeed, is produced in the effectiveness of a large proportion of photographic representations by looking at them with one eye only, that it is far better not to use the two eyes, when seeking to reproduce the original

* Many of our readers will recollect the beautiful medallion-engravings (produced by mechanical agency) that were in fashion some years ago. In these the like illusion could be produced, the same picture being caused to represent either a cameo or an intaglio, by such a disposition as made its lights and its shadows correspond with those which would have been thrown from the source of illumination, had the rays fallen on an actual cameo or an actual intaglio.

object or scene as completely as possible, and not looking for mere pictorial beauty. Thus, in the large photograph of the front of the cathedral of Rheims, and that of the interior of St. Ouen at Rouen, the disposition of the lights and shadows—alike on the principal parts and on the details—together with the general perspective, so powerfully suggest the visual idea of solidity when we look at them with one eye, that if we exclude the flat mounting of the picture, and dispose the light so as to correspond with the direction of the shadows, we can scarcely believe that we are not looking at architectural models of these buildings.

It is remarkable that the effect of this mode of viewing photographic pictures is not limited to bringing out the solid forms of objects into relief; for other features are thus seen in a manner more true to the reality, and therefore more suggestive of it. We have noticed this especially with regard to the representation of still water, which is generally one of the most unsatisfactory parts of a photograph; for although, when looked at with both eyes, its surface appears opaque like white wax, a wonderful depth and transparence are often given to it by viewing it with only one. There exists a photograph of a part of the rocks and sands at Tenby, in which not only the rugged projections and cavernous recesses of the former, but the smooth surface and gentle undulations of the latter, become most vivid to the single eye; whilst a small patch upon the sand, the meaning of which is not otherwise very apparent, then shows itself to be a most faithful portrait of a little pool of water lying in a hollow of the sand, and reflecting the rocks above. The superiority of monocular to binocular vision here depends, not only upon the freedom under which the mind is left to interpret the picture after its own fashion, when no longer forced to view it as a flat surface, but also upon the circumstance that the photograph taken by a single camera is really a portrait of the object as seen by one eye; and that whilst it is the truest possible picture when viewed under the like aspect, it is not a true picture as viewed by both eyes, since not merely the apparent shape of all near objects, but the character of their surfaces as recognised by the mode in which light is reflected from them, is sensibly different according as either eye is used singly, or both eyes together.

That the two eyes form different images of any objects which are near enough to have dissimilar perspective projections, has been known to opticians, physiologists, and artists from a very early date. Euclid proved it geometrically with reference to

a sphere; Galen, after going through a similar demonstration, tells his readers how practically to convince themselves of the fact; and Leonardo da Vinci gave the want of correspondence between the parts of the background intercepted by a near object seen by the two eyes singly, as the reason why no painting can show a *relievo* equal to that of natural objects seen by both eyes within a moderate distance. No artist, indeed, can draw a face, either from the life or from a bust, without noticing that he sees more of the right side of it with the right eye, and more of the left side with the left eye; and that the relative positions of the features are sensibly different, according as he looks at them with one eye or the other. But we have not been able to find the least trace of the principle, that to this dissimilarity of the visual pictures our notion of the *projection* of an object is directly referable. On the contrary, those writers who have most fully discussed the question seem rather to have set themselves to find out how the two are reconciled, than to inquire whether any purpose is served by their difference. The former problem, not the latter, was obviously in the mind of Aguilonius, a learned Jesuit, who published a 'Treatise on Optics' in 1613, and who attributed the union of the two dissimilar pictures into a clear and distinct image to a 'common sense,' which imparts its aid equally to each eye; this 'common sense' being specially exerted when the object is placed much nearer to one eye than to the other, so that the sizes as well as the forms of the two retinal pictures are sensibly different.* The nearest approach to the principle in question, that has yet been pointed out in the works of any writer anterior to Professor Wheatstone, occurs in the 'Treatise on Optics,' published in 1775 by Harris; who observes that 'we have other helps for distinguishing prominences of small parts, besides those by which we distinguish distances in general, as their degrees of light

* Sir D. Brewster attempts (p. 16.) to make Aguilonius's language apply especially to the vision of *solid* objects, and to show that he was acquainted with the dependence of their appearance of projection upon the dissimilarity of their pictures. But we can confirm, from personal examination of his work, Professor Wheatstone's statement, that the *σρεσα* referred to by him are not the actual solid objects, but the imaginary solids formed by lines drawn between the angles of the objects (which may be plane surfaces) and the eye. There are other misconceptions in Sir D. Brewster's account of Aguilonius's doctrines, which make it evident, as Mr. Wheatstone has pithily said, that Sir David has looked upon Aguilonius through a pseudoscope.

'and shade, and the prospect we have round them.' Again, 'by the parallax, on account of the distance betwixt our eyes, we can distinguish besides the front part the two sides of a near object not thicker than the said distance, and this gives a visible relieve to such objects, which helps greatly to raise or detach them from the plane in which they lie. Thus the nose on a face is the more remarkably raised by our seeing both sides of it at once.' Yet this is by no means the same as saying (according to the representation of Sir David Brewster) that Harris recognised the dissimilarity of the pictures as the source of the perception of projection; for as he distinctly attributes this projection to our being able to see both sides of an object at once (which, in the very example he gives, may be done with a single eye), he cannot be supposed to refer to cases in which both pictures, however dissimilar, give only one side of the object.

That notwithstanding all that had been written on the subject, no real progress had been made by any of Professor Wheatstone's predecessors, towards the discovery of the real purpose which is answered by the dissimilarity of the pictures, may fairly be inferred from the entire absence of any reference to such an idea in the 'Treatise on Optics' published by Sir David Brewster himself in 1831; for, when treating of binocular vision (p. 300.), he simply remarks that the singleness of the image of any object is due to the direction of the axis of the two eyes towards it, and to the circumstance 'of the one [picture] occupying exactly the same place as the other.' So far, therefore, from supposing that any special end was answered by the dissimilarity of the pictures, Sir David, by omitting all mention of such a dissimilarity, must be held to imply that he considered it either as a matter of no consequence, or as a difficulty to be glossed over in an elementary work.

The first enunciation that we have been able to find of the principle in question, is contained in the third edition of Mr. Herbert Mayo's 'Outlines of Human Physiology,' which appeared in 1833. That author, who was at the time Professor Wheatstone's colleague at King's College, in a short notice of Professor Wheatstone's experimental researches on binocular vision, describes the following as 'one of the most remarkable results':—

'A solid object, being so placed as to be regarded by both eyes, projects a different perspective figure on each retina; now if these two perspectives be actually copied on paper, and presented one to each eye, so as to fall on corresponding parts, the original solid figure will be apparently reproduced in such a manner that no effort of the

imagination can make it appear as a representation on a plain surface.' (P. 288.)

Now although the stereoscope is not here mentioned by name,* yet the effect produced by it is stated with such precision, that no one can reasonably hesitate to believe that the phenomena so vividly described had been actually witnessed by its instrumentality. But as doubts with regard to the existence of the stereoscope at this early period have been still urged by certain determined sceptics, it is satisfactory to find that the books of Mr. Newman, the well-known philosophical instrument maker, supply distinct evidence of his having constructed stereoscopes for Professor Wheatstone in the latter part of the year 1832. And we have ourselves seen a letter from Mr. Martin, the son of the painter of 'Belshazzar's Feast,' in which he recalls to Professor Wheatstone's recollection the fact of his having made drawings for his stereoscope, when the instrument was first exhibited by Professor Wheatstone in the private circle of his friends, and states that from particular circumstances he is able to fix the date of this occurrence as the winter of 1832. We trust that Sir David Brewster, and those whom he has led into the belief that a prior claimant to the invention could be set up, will now be satisfied that the stereoscope had been in existence, and that its essential principle had been made public, several years before any idea at all similar was worked out by any one else.

That so remarkable an invention should not have been prominently brought under the attention of the scientific world until the year 1838, when Professor Wheatstone's first memoir on *Binocular Vision* was communicated to the Royal Society, may seem to call for some explanation. The fact, however, is easily accounted for. Professor Wheatstone possesses neither that eager desire for public notoriety, nor that hastiness in the development of scientific conceptions, which lead some persons to take the earliest opportunity of bringing themselves before the public as inventors or discoverers, however immature may be the products of their labour. On the contrary, everything which he has done has been characterised by its completeness, — a feature that is no less remarkable in his original stereoscope, when compared with the crude devices for which merit has been claimed by his detractors, than it is in the memoir in which it is described. For, notwithstanding all that has been written on the subject of stereoscopic vision, we hold that its explanation has been given by no one more correctly than it was in the first instance by Professor Wheatstone. Moreover, during the

interval between 1832 and 1838, his attention was closely occupied by inquiries of an entirely different nature. In 1833, he published his admirable memoir 'On the Figures of Vibrating Surfaces,' which embodied the results of a long series of experimental researches. In 1834, he communicated to the French Academy of Sciences those masterly investigations into the velocity of electricity, and the duration of electric light, which gained him admission into that distinguished body. And from 1834 to 1838, he was engrossingly engaged in those developments of his previous electrical researches, which resulted in the electric telegraph. Sir D. Brewster's surprise 'that so remarkable an invention as the stereoscope, if actually constructed and exhibited in 1832, should have remained six years in Mr. Wheatstone's desk, and make its appearance before the public only in 1838,' may therefore well be deemed superfluous. It is to be remembered, moreover, that the photographic art was not at that time able to furnish for the stereoscope those marvellous pictures which now constitute its principal source of interest; so that, for several years after the invention of the instrument, its use was limited to mere outline diagrams of geometrical solids, and to such perspective representations of real or imaginary scenes, as the comparatively imperfect labours of the draughtsman could furnish.

The invention of the stereoscope was not a happy accident, but was the result of careful reflection on the phenomena of binocular vision. The fact being readily demonstrable, that two obviously dissimilar pictures are projected upon the two retinae, by any solid object placed within a moderate distance of the eyes, Professor Wheatstone asked himself, 'What would be the visual effect of simultaneously presenting to each eye, instead of the object itself, its projection on a plane surface, as it appears to that eye?' and the stereoscope was devised for the sake of working out, in the most satisfactory manner, the answer to that inquiry. The original form of the instrument was that which is now distinguished as the *reflecting* stereoscope; and consisted of two plane mirrors adjusted in such a manner that their backs should form a right angle with each other, whilst the salient angle formed by their junction projects towards the nose of the observer, whose eyes, directed to the inclined surfaces of the right and left mirrors respectively, receive the images of two pictures supported on a framework which is made capable of certain adjustments,—one picture being so placed as to be seen by reflection with the right eye, and the other with the left, whilst the axes of the eyes converge moderately, as if they were directed towards an actual object placed

at the same distance behind the mirrors as the pictures are from their inclined sides. The result is, that if these pictures accurately represent the two perspective projections of the object as seen by the right and the left eye respectively, and are received on the parts of the two retinæ on which the images would be formed by the actual object, that object is so vividly presented to the mind's eye as almost to impress the observer with the conviction that he really sees it; the two pictures not merely blending into a single image, but forming by their combination a resultant essentially different from either, its distinguishing character being its apparent solidity or projection in relief.

To an inventive genius like Professor Wheatstone's, it must early have become apparent that the optical combination of the two pictures might be made as well by refraction as by reflection; and there is ample evidence that he had constructed and exhibited a *refracting* stereoscope, in which the pictures are viewed through prisms, long before the idea of any such arrangement occurred to any one else.

Although the completeness of the stereoscopic illusion is favoured by the filling-up of the outlines, and by the accessories of colour and shading, yet mere outlines are quite adequate to produce it; and their power of doing this is the more remarkable, since it often happens that the solid form cannot be predicated with certainty from either of the figures viewed singly. Thus the same perspective projection of a truncated pyramid, as seen nearly in the direction of its axis, but a little to one side, will represent that pyramid as it appears to one eye of the observer with its base nearest to him, or to the other eye with its truncated apex nearest to him; or, in other words, either as a receding or as a projecting pyramid, according as it is viewed with one or the other eye. But when a pair of such perspectives of a pyramid, as seen by the right and left eyes singly, whether in the projecting or in the receding position, is placed in the stereoscope, there is no longer any possibility of doubt, the aspect of the solid represented by those perspectives being impressed on the mind with unmistakable force; and the very same pair of outlines may be made thus to reproduce either the projecting or the receding pyramid, simply by reversing their respective positions in the stereoscope, so as to throw upon each retina the picture which was previously projected on the other. A more convincing experiment may be made by setting up a coil of wire in such a manner that its turns shall cross one another in various directions, so as to present the most irregular aspect that can be impressed upon it, and by then taking two

tracings of it with the camera lucida, in the positions of the right and the left eyes respectively; for although each of these tracings, taken separately, might represent the coil as if completely flattened down, and neither by itself gives the least guidance as to which of its turns lie over and which cross under the others, yet when the two tracings are viewed in the stereoscope, every coil of the wire is seen in its actual relation to the rest, and the solid form of the original is most unmistakably presented.

Hence it is obvious that the foundation of that conception of solidity which we derive from the binocular view of a near object, is essentially different from the basis on which the like interpretation rests in the case of the monocular view of a single picture; and that it is the want of the information afforded by the dissimilarity of the two pictures, which prevents the difference between a cameo and an intaglio, or between the interior and the exterior of a mask, from being recognised when it is viewed with only one eye. For in the latter case, everything depends upon the readiness with which the interpretation is suggested to the mind by the familiarity of the object; and the mind may waver between two or more possible interpretations of the same visual picture, or may automatically fix upon that which previous experience suggests as the most obvious. But in ordinary binocular vision of a moderately near object, there is no wavering; we feel that there can be no mistake. There is but one solid form that *can* furnish the two dissimilar perspective projections; hence that form presents itself to our minds, independently of any previous acquaintance with it, as the necessary resultant of the combination of those pictures; and our conception of it is precisely the same, whether the two retinal images are formed by rays directly proceeding from the object itself, or by those of two pictures of the object, taken under the aspects which it presents to the right and the left eye respectively.

But although the basis is different in the two cases, the mental operation by which we build upon it is essentially the same. For the binocular view of an object, like the monocular, does nothing else than *suggest* to the mind a certain visual conception; and the adoption of this conception depends much more upon the antecedent condition of the mind, than it does upon the purely optical relations of the two retinal pictures. Sir David Brewster has, it is true, committed his high authority to the assertion that the latter alone are all-sufficient for the explanation of the phenomena of the stereoscope. Since, however, he not only bases his argument upon assumptions which

we cannot for a moment admit, but entirely ignores a class of phenomena which in our apprehension demonstrate its fallacy, we shall not waste our time or that of our readers in controversial discussion, but shall proceed forthwith to those more recent experimental investigations, by which the share taken by the mind in the formation of the visual conception is most clearly manifested.

In his first memoir, Professor Wheatstone noticed the singular effect produced by reversing the positions of the two stereoscopic pictures, so that the one designed for the right eye is thrown on the left, and *vice versa*. When the perspective projections are such as would represent, under this change of aspect, any actual solid, that solid is made to appear in the stereoscope; and it occurs to the mind scarcely less readily than the form from which the pictures were really taken. Thus, as was just now mentioned, the pair of outline perspectives which in one position bring up the image of a four-sided truncated pyramid with its truncated end projecting towards the observer, will, when reversed, appear as a receding pyramid.

So the outlines which, when properly placed, bring up the figure of a cube, suggest, when reversed, the frustum of a square pyramid, with its base remote from the eye. In the case of such simple geometrical figures, the converse figure is as readily apprehended as the original, because it is a figure with which we are not unfamiliar; but this is not at all the case with figures of more complex forms, the conversion of which would do violence to our habitual notions of the character of the objects they represent. This is remarkably shown when we try this reversal with photographic representations of buildings, landscapes, or groups of figures. For in some cases no 'conversion of relief' is effected at all; the only result of the change being a certain confusion which interferes with the complete realisation of the solid form, without suggesting the conception of any other. But, in other cases, a partial alteration is effected in the apparent disposition of the components of the scene; and we have found this to take place most completely when these components are most independent of each other. Thus if, instead of the picture being entirely filled by a single building or a cluster of connected buildings, it contains several detached erections, the relative distances of these may undergo a complete reversal, whilst the aspect of each separate building remains unchanged. The effect is very striking when the experiment is tried with a façade having a statue at some little distance in front of it; for by the reversal of the pictures, the statue is carried back so as to be buried (as it were) in the façade, which projects on either

side of it; yet both statue and building present their own solid forms unchanged. So in a landscape, the relative distances of trees, rocks, or other objects, may be completely reversed; whilst their own shapes undergo no metamorphosis. We have found it impossible to predicate, before trying the experiment, what degree of change will thus be effected by the reversal of any particular pair of pictures; its amount seeming to depend upon the readiness with which the mind accommodates itself in each individual case to the new visual suggestion. This is most curiously shown in the effect produced upon groups of figures; for whilst the disposition of the component parts of a building cannot be altered without doing violence to the conception of its form which is suggested to us by either of the pictures taken singly, and whilst any considerable change in the relative distances of the principal features of a landscape would be felt to be inconsistent with the notions suggested by their relative sizes as well as by the intermediate filling-up, we are conscious of no violence to our habitual associations when the several figures of a group, in sufficiently near proximity not to differ greatly in apparent size, are so altered in their relations that the nearer are made to seem more remote, while the further are brought near. It is not a little curious that this conversion may be effected in spite of the apparent mutilation of the remoter figures when they are thus brought forward, the parts which were concealed by the nearer figures being of course deficient in the image; and yet the figures themselves undergo no metamorphosis. The most complete 'conversion of relief' which we have been able to effect by the reversal of any pair of photographic pictures, presents itself with the representation of a group of dried skeletons of leaves and flowers; for the partial transparency of these allows every part of the group to be seen with tolerable distinctness, so that no apparent extinction of any of its components is occasioned by the change in their relative situations, and the converted aspect of each part is nearly that which it would present if viewed from the opposite side; so that the mind has no difficulty in accepting the new suggestion as to every individual feature of the group, excepting where the converse form would be obviously wrong, in which case the conception of the real form is unhesitatingly retained. And it is not a little remarkable that certain parts, which, through passing behind others, are partially obscured in the picture, lose this obscuration when brought forwards, being seen as they would have been if they had actually stood out in front when the picture was taken. This mental alteration of what would otherwise be an incongruity in the 'converted' image, is a most

interesting phenomenon, and it seems to occur to every individual who repeats the experiment.

The necessary inference from these phenomena appears to us to be that our mental preconceptions have much more to do with our interpretation of binocular pictures, than the mere optical relations of those pictures. If the latter had the potency which Sir D. Brewster affirms that they possess, then their reversal ought to produce the same effect in every case. Not only ought the relative positions of all the objects in the pictures to be unmistakably reversed, but their forms also ought to be metamorphosed; all their convexities should be concavities, all their projecting parts should recede inwards; in fact, the whole scene should be turned inside out. But the mind will not admit this too-strange conception; it obstinately clings to so much of the reality as is recognized by its previous experience to be the necessary interpretation of the visual impression; and it can only accept such modifications as are not grossly inconsistent with its habitual knowledge.

In his second memoir, Professor Wheatstone has furnished the means of trying those experiments upon solid forms themselves, which the stereoscope affords in regard to their pictures. For he has contrived a very simple instrument, composed of a pair of prisms set in a frame capable of certain adjustments, by which exactly the same effect is produced upon the retinal images of an actual object, as is produced in the stereoscope by the reversal of its pictures; the image projected upon either retina being that which is normally formed by the other. The results of the use of this instrument, appropriately termed by its inventor the *Pseudoscope*, are perfectly conformable to the principle already insisted on. Everything at which we look with it ought, according to the optical theory, to be at once turned inside out; but a large proportion of the objects on which we try its converting powers are proof against them, those only being readily metamorphosed whose new forms can be conceived without effort. After a great number of trials with this instrument, not only upon ourselves, but upon numerous individuals both scientific and unscientific, imaginative and practical, we have satisfied ourselves thoroughly as to the general fact, that the facility of the conversion bears a pretty constant ratio to the relative familiarity of the original and the converted forms. Thus, a cameo and an intaglio, a plaster cast in relief and its mould, the exterior and interior of a metal blanc-mange shape, or any other object equally similar in its opposite reliefs, is at once unhesitatingly metamorphosed by the pseudoscope, each into its converse form. There is none of the doubt and alter-

nation which attend this conversion under the monocular view of these objects; we apprehend the converted form, just as strongly and persistently as we recognise the real form with our unperverted pair of eyes. The only circumstance that can interfere with the illusion, is the fall of shadow on the object; and the light should therefore be so disposed as to illuminate it equally in every direction. Now if we try the experiment on the interior of a mask, or of the plaster mould of a bust, we reproduce the projecting face with the greatest certainty and constancy; but, if we look at the exterior of the mask, we have to gaze upon it, and perhaps to try to picture to ourselves the aspect of its interior, before that converse presents itself; still more difficult is it to throw the features of a bust into the semblance of its concave mould; and we have never yet succeeded in effecting the like conversion upon the features of the living face, although Professor Wheatstone informs us that he has succeeded in doing so after a fixed stare of more than half an hour. Now the optical change is identically the same in its nature in every one of these cases; and there is nothing in the form of the features which refuses to present a converse, this converted shape being pre-ented by the mask; but the mind which will admit the conception of the converted form when suggested by the inanimate mask or bust, is steeled by its previous experience against the notion that actual flesh and blood can undergo such a metamorphosis.

When an observer looks with the pseudoscope at the interior of a cup or basin, he not unfrequently sees it at first in its real form; but by prolonging his gaze, he will perceive the conversion within a few minutes; and it is curious that whilst this seems to take place quite suddenly with some individuals, as if the basin were flexible and were suddenly turned inside out, it occurs more gradually with others, the concavity slowly giving place to flatness, and the flatness progressively rising into convexity. Not unfrequently, after the conversion has taken place, the natural aspect of the object continues to intrude itself, sometimes suddenly, sometimes gradually, and for a longer or shorter interval, when the converse will again succeed it; as if the new visual impression could not at once counteract the previous results of recent experience. At last, however, the mind seems to accept the conversion without further hesitation; and, after this process has once been completely gone through, the observer, on recurring to the same object, will not find it possible to see it in any other than its converted form, unless the interval should be long enough to have allowed him to forget its aspect. Vagaries, however,

sometimes occur in these experiments, of which it is difficult to give any certain explanation, but which would probably be found referrible to the same general principle, if we were acquainted with all the conditions of its operation. It would seem as if, in cases of this kind, *time* became an element, by allowing a reiteration of the new impressions on the nervous organisation, so that they at last become sufficiently powerful to overbear those which have been left there by previous habits of action; and when these latter have once been overcome, they seem, like an army dispirited by failure, to be put to the rout by a mere alarm in future.

When such facts as these are carefully contemplated, they seem irresistibly to establish the doctrine of Berkeley, that the sense of sight informs us of nothing but apparent position, apparent figure, apparent magnitude; and that with real position, real figure, and real magnitude, we only become acquainted through the sense of touch. It is true that, if we look only to the ordinary phenomena of stereoscopic vision, we might not unreasonably infer from them that the notion of projection or solidity which we derive from the mental combination of the two dissimilar pictures is an original intuition, quite independent of tactile experience. But such an inference would be in direct contradiction to that other class of phenomena last described, which show that 'conversions of relief,' whether brought about by the reversal of the stereoscopic pictures, or by the instrumentality of the pseudoscope, have not the certainty of intuitive perceptions, but can only be effected when the visual suggestion is in harmony with the notions of form that we have previously derived through the sense of touch, which thus presides (so to speak) in a final court of appeal. And any one who attentively observes the actions of an infant during the first year of its life, will find abundant confirmation of the belief that by experience alone the two sets of sensations are brought into that correlation, which, when it has once been formed, is never afterwards disjoined. For it is obvious that the whole powers of the dawning mind are then directed towards the education of its senses, and that its perception of the forms, positions, and distances of objects, far from being intuitive as in the case of animals which have to get their own living from the first, is originally very imperfect and even fallacious, and only gradually becomes definite and trustworthy. When once the visual and the tactile perceptions have been brought into mutual co-operation, the former are invariably interpreted according to the information derived from the latter. When one eye alone is used, the interpretation may be deceptive. When both eyes, how-

ever, can be so employed as to give dissimilar pictures of a near object, the interpretation can hardly be anything else than correct. And yet even then, our minds may be so completely under the domination of previous impressions, as obstinately to refuse to admit that image, which, if the true perception of solidity were a necessary intuition, we could not fail to accept.

The complexity of the processes by which we arrive at many of our visual interpretations is masked, indeed, by the rapidity with which they take place, and by the absence of any effort, of any consciousness even, in their performance; and it is only when experimental means are devised for analysing them, that their real nature is detected. In Professor Wheatstone's second memoir, a modification of his original reflecting stereoscope is described, which enables such an analysis to be made, in regard to the separate influence upon our estimate of the sizes and distances of near objects, of two changes which are ordinarily concurrent, namely, the size of the visual picture on the retina, and the degree of convergence of the axes of the eyes. If we hold any object at arm's length from the eye, and then gradually approximate it so as to bring it as near as we can see it distinctly, its apparent magnitude is of course doubled when we have first halved its distance, and quadrupled when we have halved this a second time; the picture on the retina being first doubled and then quadrupled in every one of its dimensions. But as we do not feel that the real size of the object has undergone any change, the question arises, what is the source of this corrective influence? Professor Wheatstone refers it to the fact, that as the approximation of the object to the eyes occasions a progressively increasing convergence of the optic axes upon it, this convergence, being the chief source of our estimate of the distance of near objects, makes it felt that the alteration of apparent size, being conformable to the alteration of distance, is fully accounted for by it, and does not therefore indicate a change of real magnitude; and, with his usual ingenuity, he has contrived a very simple means of bringing this explanation to the test of experiment. All that is necessary is, that the lateral arms which carry the pictures in his reflecting stereoscope should be made to rotate round a pivot fixed beneath the junction of the mirrors; the effect of this arrangement being that, by drawing the two arms forwards, the optic axes are made to converge upon the mirrors, as if the object represented by the pictures were approximated to the eyes, whilst the pictures, moving in the circumference of the circle at the centre of which the mirrors are placed, keep their distances from the eyes unchanged. The result of this movement is very curious; the

apparent size of the pictures undergoes a most notable diminution, in proportion as the optic axes are made to converge; and this reducing process may be kept up until the convergence has increased so much that it can no longer be sustained. But this is not all; for, if the original adjustment be gradually restored, the pictures will progressively swell out to their previous dimensions; and, if the arms be then carried further backwards, so that the optic axes are made to diverge more and more from each other until they approach the condition of parallelism, the size of the picture undergoes an enormous apparent increase. Here, then, we have the remarkable phenomena of a reduction and an enlargement in the apparent size of the object under view, without a change in any thing else than the degree of convergence of the optic axes, the dimensions of the retinal pictures remaining precisely the same throughout. And it does not seem possible to accept any other explanation of this fact than the one given by Professor Wheatstone, namely, that as the effect of approximation is given by the convergence of the eyes, the mind expects a proportional enlargement of the retinal picture to sustain the identity of the object; and that, as no such consentaneous enlargement takes place, the effect produced is as if the object were really made to contract in all its dimensions as it approaches the eyes, so that the original dimensions of the retinal picture may remain the same. Of course the same explanation applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the apparent enlargement of the object, when the optic axes are made to approach toward parallelism; for this change suggests the conception of augmented distance; with augmented distance there would naturally be diminution of size; and the retinal picture could only be kept at its original dimensions by a proportional swelling-out of the object in all directions, which is accordingly what seems to take place.

It is not only by that estimate of distance which we base on the degree of convergence of the optic axes, that our estimate of size may be effected; for other kinds of suggestion produce the like modification. In fact as to all remote objects, in viewing which the axes of our eyes are virtually parallel, our estimates of size and distance are judgments formed under the guidance of antecedent experience; their size, when known or guessed at, enabling us to judge of their distance; whilst, conversely, a knowledge of their distance enables us to estimate their size. But if the data on which we base our determination of distance should be fallacious, our estimate of size will be proportionately deranged. Thus we have no doubt that most of our readers have been struck by the differences in the appa-

rent elevation of ranges of hills or mountains, which they may have had the opportunity of observing under a variety of atmospheric conditions. For when their forms and surfaces are distinguishable with unusual clearness, so that they are apparently brought nearer than they actually are, their elevation seems to be reduced, so that what is really a mountain may seem to be a hill that we could climb in half an hour. But on the other hand, when the aerial perspective carries them to a distance greater than the reality, their apparent altitude is so much increased, that a hill swells into a mountain, and the comparatively insignificant elevations of our island rise into alpine grandeur. So, again, in walking across a common in a fog or mist, we are struck with the exaggerated dimensions of figures which we see indistinctly looming through it; a child appears a man, and a man looks like a giant; the indistinctness here too giving the effect of increased distance, and increased distance producing augmentation of apparent size, because a child removed to such a distance must grow into a man, and a man into a giant, to form the picture actually impressed on the retina. So again, in stereoscopic images, all the projecting parts seem to be rather smaller than they are in the pictures, while the apparent dimensions of all the receding parts are increased; and although we are aware that Sir David Brewster, endeavours to explain this general fact upon purely optical principles, yet it appears to us much more satisfactory to associate it with phenomena which obviously belong to the same category, and on which no optical explanations can possibly be brought to bear. The effect is particularly striking when two pairs of pictures of truncated pyramids of the same linear dimensions are viewed in the stereoscope at the same time, one giving the image of the projecting, and the other of the receding pyramid; for the truncated end of the pyramid which seems to project towards the eye of the observer is seen to be sensibly smaller than that which seems to recede; and on comparing their respective apparent dimensions with those of the actual figures, it will be found that the size of the former is reduced, while that of the latter is augmented.

As our estimate of the size of objects is thus modified by our appreciation of their distance, so is our judgment of their distance affected by our knowledge of their actual size. Thus, in estimating the size of architectural monuments, or the magnitude of natural objects in mountainous countries, the inexperienced observer is apt to be totally deceived, until he refers his visual impression to some known standard of dimension. He finds out that the insect on the dome of St. Peter's is a man, or

that the speck on a colossal Alp is a chalet, and the knowledge of this fact instantly restores the true sense of proportion. To use the expression of Descartes, who pointed out the fact that the moon and other celestial bodies appear larger when they are near the horizon than at the zenith, and analysed these phenomena of vision with great nicety: 'Occurrunt inter ipsa et oculos nostros diversa objecta quæ *judicium de distantia melius informant* ex quibus patet, non omnino verum esse optiæ veterum axioma, quo magnitudines corporum apparentes visionis angulis statuuntur proportionales.' (*Dioptrics*, chap. vi. § 16-21.)

Hence it is obvious that, in regard both to near and to remote objects, our estimates of relative size and distance are acts of judgment based upon antecedent experience; but that the bases of our judgment are not the same in the two cases. For, in looking at near objects with two eyes, we have two sources of guidance which are wanting to us when the objects are remote; namely, the dissimilarity of the perspective projections upon the two retinæ, and that appreciation which we derive from the muscular sense of convergence as to the relative distances of different points to which we successively direct our gaze. According to Sir David Brewster, these are virtually identical; the perception of the solidity of an object being due to that appreciation of the relative projection of its different parts, which is gained by making the axes of the eyes converge successively upon all its principal points. And he applies the same explanation to the perception of solidity which we acquire through the stereoscope; affirming that, before the image presents itself to our minds, we must have successively directed the axes of our eyes to all the principal points of the two pictures, and that from the different degrees of convergence required to bring them to coalesce, we estimate their respective degrees of projection. We feel sure that a very little attention on the part of our readers to their own consciousness, will demonstrate to them the fallacy of this doctrine. When any object of such dimensions that its retinal picture does not extend beyond the limits of moderately distinct vision is brought before us, and viewed with both eyes at once, we *immediately* derive from the mental combination of its two dissimilar retinal projections a true conception of its solid form; and the same holds good with regard to the whole of any area of a stereoscopic picture, either in the centre or in any other part, which we can see with tolerable clearness independently of any movement of the eyes. Hence it seems to us impossible to doubt that the conception is originally due to the direct mental recog-

nition of the fact, that a solid of such a figure, and of such a figure only, would give origin to the two dissimilar projections impressed on our retina; though it may not impossibly derive increased vividness and completeness from the more detailed examination which we make of the object, when we direct our gaze to each of its principal points in succession, and estimate their relative distances from our eyes by the additional suggestions derived by our minds from the degree of convergence of the optic axes.

It will now be apparent how, when one eye is closed, we lose that certain power of distinguishing between a flat picture and a projecting relieve, or between a projecting relieve and its concave mould, which we derive from the conjoint use of both organs. We can make no mistake in our estimation of such objects, provided their dimensions and distances be such as to make their two retinal projections appreciably different, and to require a sensible difference in the convergence of the optic axes as they are successively directed to different parts. We are forced to see that a picture is nothing but a plane surface, that the outside of a mask represents the actual features of a human face, and that the hollow mould is the concave reflex of the cast which has been turned out of it, so long as these objects are within a few feet distance, and are seen by both eyes at once. And thus it becomes evident that the remarkable converting power of monocular vision, by which a single picture may be raised into stereoscopic relief, and cameos and intaglios be mistaken for each other, is—however interesting as a psychological phenomenon—really a mark of imperfection in the visual sense when thus exercised.

And that such is the true view of the case, appears further from this; that we are liable to be thus deceived in regard to the very same objects, even when we look at them with both eyes, provided that they are removed to a sufficient distance to render the difference of their retinal projections inappreciable, and to prevent the relative distances of their parts from being measured through the sense of convergence. Many of our readers will recollect the marvellous deceptiveness of the large architectural pictures formerly exhibited in the Diorama; and have probably been almost ready to swear that a particular column or statue *must* have been painted on a different surface from the rest, like a detached part of a scene in a theatre, so strongly did it seem to stand forth;—until, on slightly moving the head from side to side, the absence of any alteration in its apparent position has made it evident that it must be on the same plane with the adjacent parts. The

perplexing vividness of this deception was due, as is now well known, to the early possession by MM. Daguerre and Niepce of one form of the photographic art, which enabled them to impart to their architectural pictures a truthfulness previously unattainable, and therefore gave to these pictures an extraordinary power of suggesting the solid forms of the objects they represented. The imitation of relievos by painting seems to be an object of special study with French artists; and they have been proportionately successful in the attainment of this deceptive power. Many of the apartments in the Louvre are decorated with cornices which so vividly represent projecting forms, as to be generally mistaken for them by such as see them for the first time; and visitors to the Bourse of Paris will recollect the large allegorical paintings in its interior, which are so executed and so disposed, as very strongly to suggest to those who only view them from a distance, the perception of high relief.

Hence it is obvious that, in regard to the vision of objects beyond a certain limit of distance, we gain little, except a wider range, by the use of both eyes, and lose as little, except in the limitation of our range, by restriction to one. And thus we can readily understand from our own experience, what is the degree of deprivation which those sustain who have the misfortune to possess but a single eye. For they are obliged to base all their interpretations of the real sizes, the solid forms, and the distances of near objects, on those indications alone upon which two-eyed people are obliged to depend in regard to remote objects; and are consequently equally liable to be deceived as to various particulars, which binocular vision enables us unhesitatingly to discriminate. And it is obvious that, as they derive no assistance from the appreciation either of the dissimilarity of the retinal projections or of the convergence of the optic axes, their perception of solidity must have been entirely acquired through a comparison of visual images with tactile and muscular sensations. This is a point of no little consequence in the determination of the original source of that perception; for if the visual idea of solidity be precisely the same in a one-eyed and in a two-eyed person (and there is not the slightest reason to believe them to be otherwise), we can scarcely suppose that the processes by which it is formed can be essentially different; and we seem entitled to affirm that, in the latter case as in the former, perceptions of relief and of relative distance are the results of judgments based upon previous experience; the only difference being that in binocular vision we have some important aids to our judgment, which monocular vision does not afford.

The difference between monocular and binocular vision is.

strikingly brought out by the results of the application of the principle of the stereoscope to the Microscope. The view which we obtain of objects seen under the ordinary microscope, being monocular, is liable to the imperfections and fallacies which we have shown to be inherent in monocular vision. The true projection of their surfaces can only be guessed at by a process of mental interpretation, in which we are aided by the focal adjustments required to obtain a distinct view of parts that lie at different distances from the object-glass. Some persons, notwithstanding the information they might have derived from this source, cannot divest themselves of the notion that they see everything in the converse form, just as when looking through a pseudoscope; this conversion being, as we have shown in the case of the seal, a purely mental illusion; aided in some degree by the inversion of the image, and the consequent reversal of its shadows. There are certain microscopic objects of extreme minuteness, in regard to which even the best observers have been at issue: some interpreting as elevation what others maintain to be depression. The ingenuity of MM. Nachet, however, has succeeded in bringing to a high degree of perfection, an instrument which exhibits the solid forms of objects highly magnified by the microscope, in the same relief as if the objects were viewed by both eyes, when actually enlarged to their apparent dimensions. This is accomplished by the interposition of a prism behind the object-glass, which splits the pencils of rays proceeding from it in such a manner that two images are formed, one by the right half, and the other by the left half of the lens. These two images, which differ like the right and left hand pictures that we place in the stereoscope, are reflected by prisms that receive them on either side into two slightly converging 'bodies,' to the eye-pieces of which the right and the left eyes are respectively applied; and the result is a most satisfactory representation of the solid form of the object thus looked at, allowance being made for certain drawbacks, from which it does not seem possible that the instrument should be altogether freed. Thus, if an object having a very uneven surface, be looked at with an object-glass of short focus, it is impossible that all its parts should be distinctly seen at once with the binocular any more than with the ordinary microscope; and the multiplicity of reflections and refractions to which the rays are subjected by the interposition of the prisms, interferes so much with the performance of the highest magnifying powers, that the advantage of the binocular view is by no means what its use with lower powers would lead us to anticipate. But even with these deductions, the value of

the instrument is very great, as enabling us to obtain at a glance a much more certain knowledge of the relative projections of the different parts of an object, and consequently of its solid form, than we can acquire by the most attentive study of it under the ordinary microscope. Its use is further attended with the advantage of keeping the two eyes in their natural consentaneous activity; whereby much less fatigue is experienced than when one eye is alone employed for some length of time, and the other is either kept shut, or, by a mental effort, is closed to the mind,—the picture of surrounding objects received upon its retina not being apprehended, in consequence of the fixation of the attention upon the microscopic image received through the other eye.

It is obvious that the principle of the stereoscope cannot be applied in the same manner to the Telescope; since, as the perspective projection of any object that is distant enough to require the use of that instrument, is virtually the same, whether the object be viewed by the right or by the left eye, so the two pictures of it formed by the right and left halves of the object-glass respectively, must be so nearly identical as not to produce by their disjunction and re-combination any perception of relief. In taking sun-pictures of landscape scenery for the stereoscope, the photographer is obliged to place his cameras at a wide interval, in order to obtain that difference in the two perspective projections which is requisite for the production of the effect of different distances, when the pictures are united in the stereoscope. Beautiful as these representations are, therefore, they are untrue in this respect, that no one pair of eyes ever sees remote objects under two such dissimilar aspects at the same moment: they do, in fact, give us that view of the scenes they depict, which we should obtain by the expansion of our heads to such Brobdignagian dimensions, as to make the distance between our eyes equal to the interval between the cameras by which the pictures are taken. But they have this advantage, that they afford in regard to remote objects that means of positive appreciation of solid forms and of relative distances, which, as we have shown, we possess under ordinary conditions, in regard to near objects alone; and thus render us independent of those variations in the results of our judgment, which are liable to arise from differences, either in aerial perspective, or in the other data on which we ordinarily depend. In regard to celestial objects, it must be at once apparent that no two points on the earth's surface can afford a sufficiently wide angular distance, to enable the photographers to obtain two sufficiently dissimilar perspective projections of

any one of them, except the moon ; and of her bright face stereoscopic portraits may be obtained without the necessity of planting a pair of telescopes on the opposite sides of our globe, by taking advantage of her *libration in longitude*. For as it obviously comes to the same thing, whether the photographer who is taking two stereoscopic pictures of a bust (for example), makes his camera look at it from two different points of view, or, keeping his camera fixed, turns the object a few degrees on its axis, so the same effect is produced by that slight shifting of the moon's face, which enables us to see first a little more of one side of it and then a little more of the other, as if she remained stationary, and we walked round her. By taking two photographic pictures of the moon, therefore, at the two extreme points of her libration, and combining these in the stereoscope, it might be expected that some effect of relief or solidity would be produced ; and this idea has been so admirably carried out by Mr. De la Rue, that the stereoscopic pictures taken by his large and excellent reflector give us not merely the complete effect of general rotundity, but also that of the local projection of volcanic craters. And it is not unworthy of notice, that those who have once had their minds strongly impressed by this new perception, find it recalled to them when looking at the moon's surface through an ordinary telescope.

A very curious form of the stereoscopic illusion, dependent upon a peculiar exercise of binocular vision, has recently been brought under notice by M. Claudet, the well-known portrait photographer. In focussing his camera by looking from the other side at the inverted image formed upon the ground-glass, his attention was attracted by the fact that this image, when seen with both eyes, appears as much in relief as the object it represents. The inquiries to which he was led by his search for the *rationale* of this phenomenon have disclosed the unexpected fact, that although only one image *seems* depicted on the ground-glass, yet in reality there is a different image for every position of the eye that views it ; so that when the ground-glass is looked at with both eyes, the head being placed at a certain distance behind its centre, the right eye sees an image formed by the left side of the lens, while the image seen by the left eye is the representation of the object received through the right side of the lens. These two images represent the two different perspectives which the eyes would themselves have received of the object, had it been placed before them in an inverted position ; without the intervention of any lens ; and hence the result is a stereoscopic perception of the inverted object. If either of the eyes be closed, the effect of relief immediately dis-

appears. And if the head be moved horizontally, so that the right eye comes into the place of the left, or *vice versa*, the other eye will no longer receive an image, and the stereoscopic projection will cease. The image loses its relief, also, if the aperture of the lens be contracted, so that only the centre is used; since the binocular pictures then become virtually identical. On the other hand, the strongest effect of relief is produced when the central portion of the lens is stopped-out, and the images are formed through two apertures which are near the extremities of its horizontal diameters, so that the camera looks at the object (if we may be allowed the expression) with two distinct eyes, whose separate pictures apparently but not really coalesce on the ground-glass. It is curious that this result is not obtained when transparent paper is substituted for the ground-glass, the image seen upon it being always quite flat; and the reason appears to be that the paper, being more opaque, stops and 'fixes' the rays which the ground-glass allows to pass. When communicating these results to the Royal Society (in June, 1857) M. Claudet threw out the idea that it would be possible to construct a stereoscope, in which the two eyes, looking at an image apparently single, should see it in perfect relief, though this image should be formed, not by an actual object, but by the coalescence of the images of the two pictures of a stereoscopic slide. Notwithstanding that the truth of his experiments was questioned, the accuracy of his deductions denied, and his proposed stereoscope declared impossible as being founded on principles completely at variance with the laws of optics, by no less an authority than Sir David Brewster*, he has fully succeeded in working out his ingenious idea; and the very interesting and satisfactory result was presented to the Royal Society on the 15th of April in the present year. The instrument, which he terms a *Stereomonoscope*, is essentially a camera with two lenses, which are so fixed as to be capable of horizontal separation from each other within certain limits. When the lenses are so adjusted as to receive and refract, one of them the right-hand and the other the left-hand picture of a stereoscopic slide, and to throw their images on the same part of the ground-glass, the two eyes, placed at the proper distance and position behind the ground-glass, and directed towards the apparently single picture which it exhibits, really see two dissimilar pictures, which are the inverted representations of the originals; and thus the mind becomes impressed with the perception of an inverted solid, presenting the actual relief of the object from which the

* Photographic Journal, Nov. 21. 1857.

stereoscopic pictures were taken. Further, if the pictures represent an object which is capable of undergoing a 'conversion of relief,' and they be so placed in the instrument that the image of the right-hand picture reaches the left eye, and that of the left-hand picture is received by the right eye, the 'converted' instead of the real form is perceived. And the same result is brought about, by looking through a pseudoscope at the stereoscopic image on the ground-glass; its relief being 'converted' in just the same degree as is that of the object which it represents, when seen through the same instrument.

Another very curious application of the principle of the stereoscope has lately been brought before the French Academy by M. d'Almeda, who has successfully resolved the problem of enabling several individuals to view the same stereoscopic image at once. It will be readily understood that if the two dissimilar pictures suitable for a stereoscope be projected on an enlarged scale upon the same part of a screen, the result will be somewhat of that kind of confusion which is seen when one of the pictures of a 'dissolving view' is in the act of giving place to the other. But if one of the pictures be projected by red light and the other by green, then by viewing each picture through a glass of its own colour, it alone will be seen, and the other will be extinguished, since the red rays will not pass through the green glass, nor the green through the red; and thus, if the right-hand picture be red and the left-hand be green, by placing a piece of red glass before the right eye, and a piece of green glass before the left, as each eye receives only the picture which is proper to it, and as these pictures are seen on the same part of the screen, their place is apparently taken by a stereoscopic image, which results from their combination in the mind that receives both, and this image is seen in a neutral tint.

Although there still remain several most important points to be elucidated in the theory of binocular vision, yet if we compare our present knowledge with the state of ignorance of its fundamental principles which prevailed before the publication of Professor Wheatstone's first memoir, we see how large is our debt of gratitude to that distinguished philosopher, not only for what he has actually accomplished, but for the new methods of investigation with which he has furnished those who are disposed to prosecute the inquiry. No one was more ready in the first instance to recognise the merits of these investigations, than Sir David Brewster. At successive meetings of the British Association he conferred upon them the highest praise, both for the originality of their method and the im-

portance of their results. Of late years, however, he seems to have changed his opinion of them altogether, since he has done his utmost to lower Professor Wheatstone in the estimation both of the scientific and the general public, by ringing the changes upon the assertion that what is true is not new, and that what is new is not true. He has even allowed others to represent himself as the inventor of the stereoscope; when all that is really due to him is the substitution of a pair of semi-lenses for the two prisms in the refracting form of the instrument originally constructed by Professor Wheatstone,—a modification of the utmost importance, as we freely admit, in the popularisation of the instrument, but of no scientific value whatever. For the purposes of philosophical investigation, as well as for the production of the finest stereoscopic effects, the original reflecting instrument, with the subsequent modifications introduced in it by Professor Wheatstone, remains without a rival; and nothing but its want of portability, and the comparative costliness of the large photographic pictures which it is fitted to exhibit, prevent its superiority from being generally recognised. Sir David Brewster has claimed for himself to be the first to apply photography to the stereoscope, for the purpose of obtaining accurate binocular representations of living persons, sculpture, architecture, and landscape scenery. ‘It had never been proposed,’ he affirms, ‘to apply the reflecting stereoscope to portraiture or sculpture, or, indeed, to any useful purpose.’ But we have before us ample evidence that Professor Wheatstone had made all these applications, long before Sir D. Brewster’s invention of the lenticular form of the stereoscope; and photographic pictures adapted to the reflecting stereoscope were sold, to our own certain knowledge, by London opticians, as far back as the year 1845. Not merely, therefore, as having originated the idea on which every form of the stereoscope is based, but as having carried out that idea in the construction both of the reflecting and refracting forms of the instrument, as having developed all its most important applications, and as having furnished a theory of its operation which, if not entirely complete and satisfactory, is based, we are satisfied, on the only sure foundation—the *full recognition of the share which the mind has in the interpretation of visual sensations*,—we have not the slightest hesitation in affirming, that Professor Wheatstone is entitled to all the honours which the scientific world can award to the discoverer of a new principle in philosophy, and to the gratitude of the general public for the large addition which has been made by his ingenuity to its sources of enjoyment.

ART. VI.—*The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors, from 1057 to 1773.* By the Marquis of KILDARE. Third edition. Dublin: 1858.

IT is probable that the fasti of one of the great patrician houses of aristocratic Rome bore some resemblance to the volume before us. Lord Kildare places us amongst the images of his *gens*, arranged in a series of individual figures, and has written under each of them a record of achievements without much regard to their private characters, or to their historical bearing. Properly speaking, therefore, this book is not a biography, for it does not attempt to give us a picture of its subjects, and the different phases of their chequered fortunes. Still less does it aspire to the name of a history, since it scarcely attempts to represent the drama of events in which the Earls of Kildare performed their part, or to explain their general relation to it. But it is a descriptive genealogy, enriched with many details industriously collected from original sources, and of great value to the student of Irish history. Though it is not so much a finished work as a collection of materials, it possesses the merits of research, accuracy, and modesty. To welcome a Geraldine as a contributor to literature would be a thankless office, unless Lord Kildare had widely departed from the steps of his ancestor, who laid whole districts waste with fire and sword because he had received the nickname of 'the Rymer.' But the manner in which the present heir of this great name has executed this pleasing task is very characteristic of the unobtrusive dignity and patriotism of the first gentleman of Ireland.

Although this book mainly consists of personal incidents, it suggests several interesting general considerations. Especially it indicates very clearly how different in England and in Ireland was the fortune of the Norman aristocracy, and how important have been the results of that difference. In England the policy of the Conqueror when he was distributing the spoils of his conquest, provided against the undue aggrandisement of any of his followers; but from the first a basis for the future government of the kingdom was formed by placing a check upon the barbarous forces of feudalism, and preventing the Bohans, the Bigods, the Mowbrays, and the Montfichets from becoming an independent oligarchy of tyrants. And as from above, so also from below, the Norman lords were exposed to no despicable control from the sturdy nature of the English population, who, though subdued, remained unbroken in spirit, retained an

important element of power in the possession of land by freehold right, and, being not remotely alien in race from their conquerors, approached, and eventually regained, a position of natural equality.

Unfortunately the course of events in Ireland was different, and the difference in the result is still painfully apparent. In Ireland the power of the Crown was feeble from the first, and it gradually dwindled down to a nominal sovereignty, incapable of any of the functions of government. The authority which it exercised over the Lacies and the De Burghs, was very different from that with which it swayed their fellows in England; and it was totally unfelt by their dependents. Thus it was unable to exact military service in Ireland; it never established there the Curia Regis; and it was a mere name both as regards the majority of the Anglo-Norman settlers, and the rude masses of the Celtic population. Occasionally, indeed, a Plantagenet king sent over a Darcy or a Talbot to Dublin, who marked his lieutenancy with some act of spasmodic rigour; but this assertion of the royal title was felt only by a few, and the recollection of it quickly faded away. Thus freed from real control, the great Anglo-Norman lords established an oligarchy of petty despots in Ireland, who kept society in a state of chronic anarchy, and checked its natural growth and development. They maintained rude armies of half-savage followers, with which they either waged a destructive war amongst each other, or harassed and oppressed the native septs. In their vast palatinates the law of England was unknown; and they substituted for it a barbarous jurisprudence which drew a fatal distinction between their English and Irish vassals. In their parliaments they legislated solely in their own interests, and endeavoured to perpetuate the severance of race from race by statutes excluding the natives from commerce and intermarriage. Occasionally, indeed, the Anglo-Norman lost his caste, and, degenerating into a Celtic chieftain, became the ruler of a barbarous sept, 'after the sluttish and unclean Irish custome;' but the Statutes of Kilkenny and Drogheda prove how odious this was to the dominant race, and how completely it held itself superior to 'the Irish enemy.' As regards the condition of this, the real Irish nation, it was such as naturally would appear in a people only half conquered, and kept in barbarism by the feuds of a turbulent oligarchy. It was alien in race from its Anglo-Norman superiors, and did not seek to obtain an equality with them. For the most part, it was debarred from their laws and institutions, but resting in swarms on the soil, it remained nominally under the rule of Anglo-Norman nobles, though really

under that of its own customs and native princes. And, as it was only made acquainted with the English name by edicts of cruel or selfish tyranny, or by wanton invasions and spoliations, it continued in its aboriginal state, rarely mingling with the dominant race, and retaliating these acts of feudal oppression by a desultory and predatory warfare.

The natural result of this state of Ireland was the decline of the central English Government, the domination of a haughty and independent oligarchy, the separation of the people into two hostile castes, and the rule of chronic disorder and barbarism. In the time of Henry VII. the authority of the Crown in Ireland was at its lowest point; the king's writ ran in parts of four counties only; and the king's army was only the levy of a deputy, who was generally one of the great Anglo-Norman nobles. At this time also the Anglo-Norman oligarchy had become reduced to a small number of leading families, which, in fact, were quite independent of England, some of them having degenerated into Celtic chieftains. The native race had extended the bounds of its territory; it had almost effaced the English name in three provinces, and had spread far into the centre of Leinster; and its princes, risen in dignity and power, had been gradually connecting themselves with their conquerors. A state of war, however, continued between the two races, for they never had been allowed to coalesce into a nation; and the barren and desolate aspect of the land was a faithful witness to the barbarism of its inhabitants. The Tudor sovereigns found themselves in Ireland bereft of authority, confronted by a hostile and reckless oligarchy, — the lords of immense districts and palatinates, whose power made them dangerous subjects, — and menaced by an alien and barbarous nation who paid no allegiance to the English Crown. They were not slow to perceive the peril of this state of things, and resolved, with characteristic determination, to subdue these elements of opposition. The policy of every one of them was ultimately the same, to subjugate Ireland at any cost, and by any means, however unscrupulous; and it was pursued by their able instruments with steady and unrelenting vigour. Thus commenced that fierce strife between England and Ireland, which, after it had raged for about a century, and at length had assumed the shape of a war of religion, was terminated by the conquest of the weaker country. In that strife the old Anglo-Norman aristocracy, with such of the Celtic chiefs as had joined them, were overwhelmed, and with some exceptions destroyed; and, when something like peace was at last established, their place was

filled up by a new aristocracy of English colonists, who, being alien in race and in faith from the natives, brought into the island fresh elements of disorder. By that strife, too, the Irishry were kept down in barbarism, and were never allowed to acquire the habits of civilisation; until at length, separated from their English masters by a double line of demarcation, they sank into an abject and fearful servitude. These were some of the evils which the early establishment in Ireland of a domineering and powerful feudalism transmitted to succeeding generations.

Such is the general view this volume suggests to us; but it is time that we should speak of its contents, and of that great house of the Geraldines which forms so marked a figure in Irish history. They are first known by the name of Gerardine, which became latinised into that of Geraldini, and appears in France under that of Girardin. In the tenth century the Gherardini were barons of Tuscany, long before the dawn of the glory of Florence, and while the yoke of Germany in Italy was yet recent. It is uncertain whether they were of the native race, or belonged to those Germans who had crossed the Alps with Otho the Great; or to those Normans who at an early period settled in parts of Italy. But the ruins of their castles may still be seen in the Val D'Elsa; the race still survives among the noble families of Tuscany and Lombardy; and we know from the graceful verse of Surrey, and a curious letter from Gerald, eighth Earl of Kildare, that long after they had become great nobles in Ireland they looked back with pride to their Tuscan birthplace. As early as 1057, Otho, one of the family, had migrated from Italy to England, and had risen to high honour at the court of Edward the Confessor. But although he died the lord of more than thirty manors, and his son at the Conquest was treated as a Norman, his family did not take deep root in England; and the establishment of the Irish Geraldines is due to his great-grandson, Maurice Fitz-Gerald.

When the storm of the Norman invasion swept over Ireland, Maurice Fitz-Gerald was one of its boldest spirits. Giraldus Cambrensis tells us, that 'in military affairs he was valiant, and second to few in activity, neither impetuous nor rash, but circumspect in attack, and resolute in defence; a sober, modest, and chaste man, constant, trusty, and faithful;' in short, an ideal of the knightly noble. With six hundred men-at-arms only, he overthrew the Celtic host of thirty thousand, at Finglas, near Dublin, and took an active part in the first subjugation of Ireland. He obtained there a considerable territory, although exposed to the jealousy of Strongbow; and through his two

sons, Gerald and Thomas, he became the ancestor of the Kildare and Desmond Geraldines. The former family soon spread over the fertile region between Dublin and the King's County; the line of their castles reached from Maynooth on the east, to Athy and Geashill on the west, and part of the feudal signory is still held by their descendants. The fate of the Desmonds was less fortunate; they became feudal sovereigns of the greater part of Munster, but, isolated among the Celtic tribes, they gradually lost all connexion with England, and at the close of a long contest with the Tudors and Stuarts, which sometimes rose to the dignity of a real war, they were destroyed in the reign of James the First. Some of their descendants may linger in the wilds of Kerry, or among the fertile valleys of Limerick, but the burning pine of the Desmonds has long been extinguished, and the only visible record of their grandeur is the long chain of their castles by the Shannon and Blackwater, which grimly frown above their vast domain, now rich with the industry of an alien race.

Lord Kildare's book treats only of the Kildare Geraldines, of whom the Duke of Leinster is now the head and representative. In the period of feudal and barbarian Ireland, between 1172 and 1540, they were among the chief of the Anglo-Norman settlers. Shortly after the conquest, they had penetrated as far as Armagh on the north, and Sligo and Roscommon on the west, but, as the power of the invading race declined, they seem to have fallen back upon their original territory, and upon a district near Adare in Munster, which connected them with their Desmond kindred. In the beginning of the fourteenth century, the head of the family was made Earl of Kildare by Edward II., 'for good service against the Scots;' and the title still continues after twenty-two descents.

The Earls of Kildare occasionally followed the Plantagenets in their long struggle with France and Scotland, but less as vassals than as independent princes. They frequently were the delegates of the Crown in Ireland, within the narrow limits of its jurisdiction; and as Lords Deputies, or High Justiciaries, convened parliaments, gave the royal assent to laws, or led the Norman soldiery under the standard of St. George. Two or three times in the course of three centuries they were made to feel that the sovereign retained some authority whenever an English deputy of the Plantagenets had power enough to curb their feudal violence, or to punish their breaches of Norman statutes. But usually they lived like sovereigns in their own territory, and could boast that it was free from the law and the king, although this was rather by long prescription than of right, for

they appear never to have held a palatinate. In this region they levied the rude taxes of coyne and livery for themselves; their seneschals were the only ministers of justice, and the subsidies and judges of the Plantagenets were unknown. There they received the homage of knights created by themselves, and summoned troops of men-at-arms to their standards. There, regardless of Anglo-Norman ordinances, they sought the alliance of such Celtic chieftains as could lead a motley host of Galloglasses against their feudal enemies, or devastate the lordships of the Butlers and De Burghs. And thus, too, though they never degenerated from the Norman type, they occasionally acknowledged the princes of Leix and Offaley as equals, or bestowed a son or daughter in marriage among them, as the Irishry grew more powerful along the English marches.

Such, at the accession of Henry VII., was the condition of the Kildare Geraldines. The head of the family was Gerald, eighth Earl, a type of the Norman noble in sovereign independence. He had brilliant accomplishments, a princely bearing, a strong and fierce will, and a daring ambition. The list of his library, at Maynooth, is worthy of a scholar; he corresponded with the Gherardini, still settled at Florence, and his name and race were familiar to the author of 'Orlando.' But he was 'a warrior incomparable,' and of 'a retchlesse dyligence' in the field; and as he swept through the Irish Kerne, at the head of the Norman battle, they saluted him as 'the Great Gerald.' Though Lord Deputy, the office added little to his splendour; as, probably, he was the most powerful subject in Great Britain since the plume of Warwick had sunk at Barnet. For, in addition to the authority his vast possessions conferred, he had extended his influence all over Ireland by intermarriages with the great Norman Houses of Butler and De Burgh, and with the Irish clans of O'Neill, Macarthy, and O'Connor; and he was closely allied to his relations, the Desmonds of Munster. And thus, besides the feudal army which he and his Norman kindred could call into the field, he could command the services of a vast array of Irish Kerne and Galloglasses, whom Hall describes as 'fighting hardily and sticking to it valyauntly, 'though almost naked, without harneys or armure.' The Courtenays and Stanleys, who did homage to Henry VII. at Sheen or Greenwich, were nobles of a very different stamp from the great Earl, who, unrestrained by law, and in a barbarous country, stood at the head of the Normans and Celts of Ireland, and at a word could call two races to his standard.

Henry VII. was soon made aware of the danger of such a subject. Like several of the lords of Ireland, Kildare was a

Yorkist, and accordingly he took up the cause of Lambert Simnel; though Lord Deputy, he crowned him in Dublin with his own hand, and sent an army of Gallo-glasses to the battle of Stoke, where his brother, Lord Thomas Fitz-Gerald, perished. But at this time the power of the Crown was not sufficient to control a noble who declared 'that he would rather become Irish, than be bound in surety to obey the King;' and Sir Richard Edgecombe, whom, in 1488, Henry had sent to Ireland as Lord Deputy, returned to his master after a fruitless errand. Soon afterwards, however, a feud broke out between Kildare and the Butlers, who had always been true to the Red Rose; the Norman territory, now shrunk to the narrow limits of the Pale, was devastated by a savage warfare; and Kildare, having been suspected of correspondence with Perkin Warbeck, in which his cousin, the Earl of Desmond, was also implicated, Henry seized the opportunity to try 'and set his country of Ireland in order.' He sent Sir Edward Poynings to Dublin, as Lord Deputy, attended by a force of a thousand men, who, for a moment, appear to have silenced opposition; and in a Parliament held at Drogheda, under these auspices, a real attempt was made towards the subjugation of Ireland. Among other laws of great importance now passed with this object, and to which we shall recur when they become really effective in Ireland, an act for the attainder of Gerald was obtained; his alliances with the Celtic chieftains were denounced; the war cry of 'Cromaboo,' at which his Irish retainers were summoned, was declared, 'contrary to the King's laws, his crown, and dignity;' and he was called over to England to account for his offences.

But the vigour of Sir Edward Poynings was only momentary, and Henry VII., unable to deal with Kildare as he dealt with Warwick and the Earl of Suffolk, was satisfied for the present with establishing a precedent of government, and reinstated the Earl in all his honours. A story is told that when Kildare was brought before the council, the King was amused with the audacious bluntness of his admissions; and that when the Bishop of Meath had exclaimed, 'all Ireland cannot rule this man,' Henry retorted, 'then this man shall rule all Ireland.*' Be this as it may, the act of attainder was at once reversed, and in 1496 the Earl of Kildare was again Lord Deputy, though his eldest

* This story, though told by most of the historians of Ireland, and cited by Mr. Froude (*Hist.* vol. ii. p. 259.), appears to rest on very little foundation. It is inconsistent with the crafty and cruel character of Henry VII.

son, Gerald, was retained as hostage in England. He appears to have been not unmindful of the double lesson he had learned from the Drogheda Parliament and from the policy or generosity of Henry; for he remained a faithful subject until his death, and performed several important services. Thus in 1497 he was in arms against Perkin Warbeck near Cork, just at the time when the great insurrection of Cornwall, and the repeated efforts of James of Scotland, had brought the throne of the first Tudor into extreme peril; and in 1505 he overthrew the Celtic army of the West, under the leadership of his kinsman De Burgh, at the decisive battle of Cnock Tuagh. He also strengthened the frontier fortresses of the Pale; and, notwithstanding his Irish connexions, obtained the character 'of a great suppressor of rebels.' Henry gave him the Garter in 1505, and bestowed on him the hand of an English heiress, with several manors in Warwick and Gloucester. When he died in 1513 from the effects of a wound inflicted by one of the O'Moores in a border foray, the star of the Geraldines shone with such great brightness, that it attracted attention far beyond Ireland; and Ariosto thus commemorates the families, but confounds their blazonry:—

'Or guarda gl' Ibernesi appresso il piano:
Sono due squadre, e il Conte di Childera
Mena la prima; e il Conte di Desmond
Da fiori monti ha tratta la seconda.
Nello stendardo, il primo ha un pino ardente;
L' altro nel bianco una vermiglia banda.'

Orl. Fur. Canto x. st. 87.

Gerald, ninth Earl, succeeded to this vast dominion, and, as if by inheritance, to the office of Lord Deputy. He had his father's valour and noble bearing; and shone amongst the chivalry on the Field of the Cloth of Gold, but he was wanting in prudence and skill to read the signs of coming events. The dream of Ireland free from the House of Tudor, and subject to a Geraldine sovereign, may perhaps have crossed his imagination; and he certainly threw his whole weight into the scale opposed to the English interest, which now began to arise in Ireland. He maintained a fierce feud with the House of Ormonde—the firm ally of the Tudor dynasty—which now was virtually headed by his sister Margaret, 'the great countess,' who hated him with an unnatural hatred. He united himself closely with his cousin the Earl of Desmond, who, living as a sovereign among the Celtic tribes, held the Crown of England in contempt, and had begun that perilous traffic with foreign powers, which ultimately led to the downfall of his race. And in defiance of the Drogheda Parliament he had married two of his daughters to the Irish

chiefs, O'Carroll of Ely, and O'Connor Faly, whose territories, lying along the frontiers of the Pale, extended his influence into the centre of Ireland. But the end of all this greatness was approaching, and the House of Kildare, now at the height of its splendour, was soon to suffer a disastrous eclipse.

The time had arrived when the government of England, consolidated on the wreck of English feudalism, was to commence that subjugation of Ireland which was accomplished under such fatal conditions that its evil results are still apparent. As early as 1515, probably by the advice of Wolsey, Henry VIII. had turned his attention seriously to Ireland; and a state paper of this date gives a vivid picture of its condition under feudal and Celtic anarchy. This report describes the weakness of the English government, the overwhelming power of the Norman aristocracy, the barbarous independence of the Irish tribes, and the lawlessness and misery everywhere prevalent. Henry VIII. resolved to cope with this state of things; and although his minister perhaps is entitled to the credit, it is due to him to admit that his policy as regards Ireland had liberal and useful objects in contemplation. He seems to have thought that his government could make itself felt, and that Irish feudalism could be reduced, by balancing the Butlers against the Geraldines; and that its worst evils could be removed and the land be brought into peaceful subjection to the crown, by extending a just and equal law to the Celtic tribes, which hitherto had been excluded from it. Accordingly he made a favourite of Ormonde, kept a jealous watch on Desmond and Kildare, and, in 1520, in a remarkable despatch, directed that Ireland, 'that fertile and commodious land,' should no longer 'lack politic governance, and good justice.'

The state of Ireland, however, a prey to Norman and Irish barbarism, was destined not to be changed by this policy, although Henry clung to it for a long time, and seems to have wished to recur to it all his life. In 1520, Gerald was dismissed from his office; but although it was said that he had directed his son-in-law to rise in arms against the English Pale, Henry wrote that he had 'noon evident testimonies' against him, and soon afterwards 'released him from warde.' The Earl of Surrey was put in his place, and told the king plainly, that nothing would subdue the country but a force such as Edward I. had employed against the Welsh; but his master rejected a measure of extermination. When, however, Lord Ossory had succeeded Surrey, who, accustomed to the Scottish wars of the border, had managed to keep Ireland in some kind of order, the difficulty of making the influence of government felt, through

the chaos of Norman and Celtic anarchy, began to show itself more distinctly, and it was clear that the antagonistic forces would come in conflict. The land was convulsed by the strife between the Butlers and the Geraldines; the Earl of Kildare appeared with an army of vassals composed of feudal and Irish retainers; and the Earl of Desmond treated with Francis I., who was then in open enmity with England. For the moment, however, Henry did nothing; he even reappointed Kildare Lord Deputy in 1524, when a curious 'indenture' was drawn up between them, which reveals the impotence of the kingly authority. This change was altogether against the interest of the Crown; and Kildare seems to have presumed upon the weakness of the king, for he was charged by his feudal enemy in 1527 with having conspired with the Earl of Desmond to bring a Spanish army into Ireland. He was summoned to London to answer for this offence; and when there he had the audacity or folly to advise a Celtic rising in Ireland against the English government. He was again, however, released under heavy securities; and in 1532 was once more Lord Deputy, when he seems, if not to have meditated rebellion, to have planned the ruin of his feudal enemies, and of the English Privy Council in Dublin, which Henry had placed as a check upon him. He removed the royal cannon from the castle and fortified his own fortresses with it. He 'displayed his own standard' in the Butler country, and wasted it with his men-at-arms and Gallo-glasses. He filled the Privy Council with his own adherents, 'who were partly corrupted with affection towards him, 'and partly were in such dread of him, that they either would 'not, or could not, do anything that could be displeasing to him.' Finally he drew more closely than ever to his Geraldine kindred, and threw himself into the arms of his Celtic relations, who seem to have really considered his race as sovereign, and one of whom had but recently exclaimed 'that in Ireland he knew 'nothing of a king of England.'

The mild policy of Henry had failed, because it had to deal with elements unfitted for it. It was now evident that the power of the Crown could never be felt in Ireland while the league of the Geraldines and their allies was unbroken. Accordingly, 'the destruction of the blood of the Geraldines was 'determined,' as a condition of the subjugation of Ireland; and had this been the only price she paid for this object, the historian would not deny that the debt was due in part, nor look too narrowly at the mode of its exaction. But from this point begins that long strife between the English monarchy and the forces of feudal and Celtic Ireland, which, after raging for a century with

few intermissions, and marking its changing progress with fearful characters, leads on to the iron rule of Cromwell, the fatal period of the Penal Code, the protracted hostility of race and sect in a common country, and the destruction of the elements of Irish prosperity. At present, however, this was all in the depths of the future; in 1534, Earl Gerald for his many offences was arrested and imprisoned in the Tower; and there, happily for himself, he died soon afterwards, transmitting to his son, Lord Thomas, then only twenty years of age, the perilous grandeur of his inheritance. The period of his death was exactly that when Henry's final breach with Rome had rent England into opposing factions, had roused the indignation of Spain, and had given to the anti-English Normans and Celts in Ireland, a prospect of alliances abroad, and of a Catholic standard of treason at home. The young Earl was unable to resist the vision of a rebellion, which, backed by Rome and Spain, should expel the heretic Tudor from Ireland, and should set up an orthodox Geraldine on a throne supported by the Pope and Charles V. He hurriedly denounced Henry at the Privy Council for his 'heresy, lechery, and tyranny;' collected a rude array of retainers and Celts, with which he swept the unresisting region of the Pale; and, having stained his hands with many cruelties, and perhaps with the blood of Archbishop Allen, he sat down to besiege Dublin. In the meantime couriers had been sent to the Pope and the Emperor, to give spiritual and secular aid to the cause; and the Earl of Desmond, true to the Geraldine standard, spread the flame of rebellion through Cork and Limerick. But after some months' delay, an English army was landed at Dublin, which forced the abandonment of the siege; the Earl of Ossory attacked the rear of the rebel array; the great fortress of Maynooth was taken by Skeffington; the expected sails from Spain did not appear off Dungarvan; and the earl, harassed and menaced at all points, and deserted by the majority of his followers, took refuge among the woods and morasses which formed the territory of his brother-in-law O'Connor Faly. Here, hunted as an outlaw, and with a price set on his head, he was preserved for a time by Celtic fidelity; but at length, seduced by the promises of the Privy Council in Dublin, he surrendered himself to his cousin Lord Leonard Grey, under a pledge of safety, which was not ambiguous, although perhaps insufficiently precise. Very soon afterwards he was sent to the Tower, where he seems to have been treated with much severity. Though evidently embarrassed by the promise of his deputy, Henry was not long in making up his mind how to deal with his captive. If capable of a compre-

hensive policy, he was stern and unrelenting in character, and especially reckless of obligations. He had seen his government in Ireland defied by a Geraldine league, and the country swept by a cruel civil and religious war, which connected itself with his enemies abroad. He had felt how impossible it was to subdue an island, where one family could unite against him a mass of chaotic forces, unfit for the arts of peace, if incapable of regular war. The Geraldines were therefore to be extinguished; and what was a deputy's word in comparison to this advantage? Accordingly he let loose his power upon the hapless family; endeavoured to extirpate the name in the region of the Pale; and, having arrested all the brothers of the late earl, he sent them to Tyburn with their unfortunate nephew, although two of them were undoubtedly innocent. A sweeping act of attainder was then passed against the race; and it is said that of the great house of the Kildare Geraldines only two males were left alive — Gerald, the half-brother of the last earl, and Edward, his brother, who was in England during the rebellion.*

* Mr. Froude, in his 'History of the Reign of Henry VIII.,' has devoted a chapter to the 'Geraldines of Kildare' (vol. ii. chap. 8.), which is one of the most brilliant and novel portions of his work; but we regret to add that it is as deficient in accuracy and fidelity as the other chapters to which we have recently given a more extended notice. In justice to Mr. Froude it should, however, be stated that Lord Kildare's researches into his family history had not been made public at the time of the publication of the passages in question. The following are some of his mis-statements and exaggerations with respect to the Geraldines and their rebellion: — 1. The name of the eighth Earl of Kildare was not 'Thomas' (Hist. p. 258.), but 'Gerald.' 2. Of 'murder' (Hist. p. 259.) in any reasonable sense he seems to have been innocent; and his 'treason' was confined to a correspondence with Perkin Warbeck. 3. He did not 'return from England a Knight of the Garter' (Hist. p. 259.); that honour was conferred upon him in 1505, nine years after his return, on account of his services against Perkin Warbeck (see 'Rymer's Fœdera,' xi. 503.), and against the Irish chiefs under Ulick De Burgh at the great battle of Cnock Tuagh. 4. The letters said to have been written by Gerald, the ninth Earl of Kildare, to O'Neill and O'Carroll, were neither 'intercepted,' nor 'detected' (Hist. pp. 264-6.). Surrey, writing to Wolsey, only says that they had been forwarded by the Abbot of Monasterevan, and that he could not get at them (State Papers, ii. 33.); and this personage, who, according to Mr. Froude, 'of all living Englishmen combined in the highest degree the necessary qualities of soldier and statesman,' does not scruple to advise that Kildare's secretary should be tortured in the hope of obtaining them. Indeed, that they were either never found at all, or that they never bore a treasonable meaning, may be inferred from a letter of Henry to Surrey, in which

From this time, though soon restored to their title and Irish estates, the Earls of Kildare lose their place in Irish history ;

he expresses a resolution 'to release the earl from warde,' as there were 'noon evident testimonies against him' (State Papers, ii. 56.). 5. The only proof that Kildare participated, in 1523, in Desmond's conspiracy, is the Irish 'Act of Attainder,' 28 Hen. VIII. c. i., cited by Mr. Froude (Hist. p. 267.). But, as early as 1524, this very charge against the earl was investigated by the Special Commission sent by the king to Dublin for the purpose ; who reported in favour of Kildare, and two months afterwards he was appointed Lord Deputy. 6. Mr. Froude adopts, as historically true, all the complaints of the Earl of Ossory (he calls him Ormonde incorrectly) against the Geraldines ; but he does not notice the fact that Ossory was their inveterate enemy, and that as he had surrendered his earldom of Ormonde to the king, who subsequently bestowed it upon Sir Thomas Boleyn, he was pretty certain, in 1526-7, of finding in Henry a willing listener to any of his statements. 7. The 'Act of Attainder' is the only evidence that, in 1534, Kildare instigated his son's rebellion ; and, as in 1528 he had suffered heavily for giving similar advice, we think that this statement should have been corroborated, more especially if we remember that at this time the Earl was completely in Henry's power. 8. All historians agree in ascribing the capture of Maynooth Castle to the treachery of Parsee, its castellan ; Mr. Froude, ever anxious to glorify Henry VIII., attributes it solely to the effects of the English cannon, on the range of which it appeared the royal artillerist 'made some experiments.' 9. Mr. Froude admits that Lord Thomas Fitz-Gerald surrendered to Lord Leonard Grey upon conditions (Hist. p. 304.), but he implies that the 'traitor' dealt with this nobleman only ; whereas it is plain that he had obtained a pledge of 'comfort' from the Council (State Papers, ii. 275.), in virtue of which 'he had been allured' to yield ; and the monstrous plea that Henry VIII. was not bound by such a promise (Hist. p. 304.), though quite a commonplace in Mr. Froude's system of political ethics, and especially urged with reference to the victims of the Pilgrimage of Grace (see Hist. vol. iii.), appears, in this instance, not to have occurred to the kingly casuist himself, for his letter to Sir William Skeffington (State Papers, ii. 275.) betrays an uneasy feeling that it was not quite in accordance even with a Tudor conscience, to deal with his captive in a manner 'convenable 'to his deservings.' This scruple, however, was speedily removed by the plain-speaking of Audeley, 'that the bludde of the Garroldes' ought 'to be holy extinct ;' and by the cruel—Mr. Froude calls it 'the business-like'—counsel of Norfolk, —'the soldier and states-man,' — 'quod defertur non aufertur,' i.e. keep your prisoner in an agony of suspense and hope, in order to redeem your plighted word, and hang him when he shall begin to think the bitterness of death is past. 10. The five uncles of Lord Thomas Fitz-Gerald, who were all slaughtered with him, pursuant to Chancellor Audeley's sage advice, were not 'all implicated in the insurrection' (Hist. p. 306.),

happily for themselves, they never united with the Desmonds in their contest with Elizabeth; and they are always found on the side of England in the protracted strife of the next century. Two or three times only, from 1540 to 1753, their fortunes are of historical interest; and, as they escaped proscription during this period, they illustrate the truth of the remark, that those are happy whose annals present few records. But the adventures of Gerald the eleventh Earl are interesting; and we wish that we could have obtained more insight into his character, as it probably determined the fate of his family. At the bloody close of Earl Thomas's rebellion, he was hurriedly conveyed 'in a basket' into the territory of the O'Connor Faly; and thence, through a long waste of forest and morass, he escaped into the Desmond dominions, where he was placed under the care of Lady Eleanor Fitz-Gerald, a sister of the ninth Earl, who was now the widow of the chief of the Macarthys. Here the young Iulus of a princely House — he was only in his twelfth year — became an object of fierce pursuit to the English Government, and a rallying point for the relics of the Irish rebellion. The letters of Cowley, of Ormonde, and of Brabazon, show how important his capture appeared to Henry; how they felt 'that so long as this younge traytour and his company were abroad, we never should be in securitie here;' and how, 'if once the boy might be had, the traytour's power was nothing.' On the other side, the Desmonds and the Irish clans beheld in the child a possible sovereign of Ireland, of a race that had given fearful pledges to rebellion, and that had gained the favour of foreign powers; and they formed a large confederacy to protect him, and perhaps to commence a new outbreak. This, however, unaided by foreign succour, soon melted away and disappeared; and in 1540, the youthful Gerald, accompanied only by three attendants, escaped to France, 'convayed aboard the shippe in a small cocke, having on but a saffronyd shurt, and bareheaded lyke one of the wild Yresshe.' He was received at the Court of Francis I., and afterwards at that of Charles V., still pursued by the unrelenting vengeance of Henry and by the fond regret of Celtic Ireland, 'who,' it was said, 'yf they might see young Geroldes banner dysplayed, yf they should lose half their substance, they would rejoyce more at the same than otherwyse to gain goodes.' But though at the breaking out of the

for Lord Leonard Grey expressly (State Papers, ii. 234.) commends the loyalty of two of them in 1535. But Tudor proscriptions were usually large in their sweep, and, as Mr. Froude says somewhere, 'made clean work.'

war of 1545, Francis I. wished to make him a beacon of Irish rebellion, he was either too young or too wise for the perilous honour; and his youth was spent under the care of Reginald Pole, among the palaces of Rome, or his ancestral Florence. We may guess what lessons of treason or loyalty he must have learned from one who had seen his whole house fall beneath a Tudor's axe, and yet was an archbishop of that Tudor's daughter; but it would appear that his Celtic associations were early forgotten, and that he became an Englishman in tastes, policy, and religion.

On the death of Henry VIII. he came to England, and, probably owing to his connexion with Pole, rose in favour at the Court of Mary Tudor. He was restored to his title and lands in Ireland in 1554, and then revisited his native country; when — so run the *Annals of the Four Masters* — ‘there was ‘great rejoicing throughout the greater part of Leath Mogha.’ With him was O'Connor Faly, the husband of his sister*, who had given him shelter among the wastes of Geashill when a fugitive, and whose heroic daughter, the Lady Margaret, had recently crossed the sea ‘to obtain her father from the Queen's ‘mercy,’ for he had been made a captive by Bellingham. She had succeeded, and in Kildare and the King's county there was still great joy though they had lately been purged of Norman and Celt, ‘for it was thought that not one of the ‘descendants of the Earls of Kildare or of the O'Connors Faly ‘would ever come to Ireland.’ It was not, however, till 1569, after Gerald had conformed to the established religion, and had proved to Elizabeth his loyalty to England, that the Act of Attainder was reversed, and his precedence was given to him. But, though once more head of the House of the Geraldines, he held through life a very different position from either of his immediate ancestors, as regards the Crown and the nation of Ireland. He was no longer a feudal prince, but a courtier of Elizabeth; and in the strife which was now raging between England and Ireland, he abandoned the standard of rebellion, and followed that of the conqueror. The selection was fortunate for himself, and although romance might delight to picture him at the head of his race in the great Desmond war of 1580, we think his choice was such as might have been expected, when we reflect upon the points at issue in the contest and upon his religion and recent associations.

* Half-sister to the Lady Elizabeth Fitz-Gerald, who was daughter of Gerald, the ninth Earl, by his second wife, the Lady E. Grey, and was the fair Geraldine of Lord Surrey. Surrey's verses about her are well known.

The Ireland of 1570-80 was very different from that which he had beheld in his youthful wanderings. Though for a short time Henry VIII. had recurred to his original Irish policy, the rude chaos of Norman and Celtic elements had refused to conform to law and government, and thenceforth other processes were used against Ireland. From that time the iron flail of Talus was ever in the train of the beneficent Arthegal. Bellingham had driven the O'Moores and O'Connors out of Leix and Offaley, and had planted there the towns of Maryborough and Philipstown. St. Leger had penetrated into the Desmond territories, and had received the homage of the great Earl, at his town of Kilmallock. By confiscation for alleged treasons, and by plunder through the fiction of surrenders of lands, which never were fully regranted, vast estates had been wrested from Norman and Celtic proprietors. Thus by force, by fraud, or through one-sided treaties, the power of the Crown of England had largely advanced,—into the wilds of Ulster among the O'Neills and O'Donnells, into the rocky fastnesses of Clare and Kerry, and even among the De Burghs in Connaught. The Pale had now spread out into twenty counties in which the Queen's writs ran, and her judges held assizes. Much, no doubt, remained to be done, for as yet part of the country was unsubdued, and like the wrecks of the forest in the waste but recently cleared, the old Celtic laws and customs still obtained in many of the conquered districts. But the subjugation of Ireland had rapidly progressed; and under a statute passed by Sir Edward Poynings at Drogheda, and two acts of Philip and Mary, which virtually made it a mere organ of the Crown, a Parliament occasionally sate in Dublin, very different from the feudal conventions of the Pale, and to a great extent filled with the Sovereign's instruments. This assembly exercised a strong control over that part of the country now subject to English law; and it had recently abolished the taxes of coyne and livery, which had been so great a source of feudal exaction. Thus baffled by an ever-increasing power, Norman and Celtic Ireland had no alternative but to conspire in wild rebellions, or to sink beneath a stern despotism, out of which, however, a new life of order might have risen. And it is probable that this latter change would have occurred, though not without a period of vehement strife, had not, at the very crisis of Elizabeth's reign, a fresh element of disturbance intervened, which prolonged and varied the original struggle.

That element was the difference of religion, and all that in those days was involved in that difference. Through Acts of Six Articles and Smithfield fires England had made her

way to a purer faith, and the nation was now essentially Protestant. But Ireland, sunk in turbulent anarchy, had rejected the dayspring of the Reformation; and with the exception of some Anglo-Norman families she remained devoted to Romanism. In Elizabeth's reign the fierce war of the two religions broke out; and England, placed at the head of the Protestant powers, and with very little aid from abroad, was assailed by all the forces of Spain. In the long struggle, it was the fate of Ireland to be an important object to both the belligerents. She was the weak point of England; and England resolved to subdue her by such means as organised strength can oppose to anarchy, and, as hitherto, for forty years, had been employed with success. She was linked to Spain by the ties of a common faith and an ancient commerce; and Spain determined to use her as a place of arms against England. Each power was sufficiently strong for its purpose. The policy of subjugating Ireland was recklessly pursued by the able lieutenants of Elizabeth: they wrested millions of acres from their former possessors, and a stream of Anglo-Protestant colonists was poured into the island. At the same time Catholicism was excluded from citizenship and exposed to a degrading series of disabilities; and a trophy of conquest and insult was raised upon the ruins of the ancient Church, in an alien and hostile Protestant establishment. The old Norman and Celtic races, proscribed by Sussex and Grey, plundered by flocks of adventurers from across the Channel, in view of the desecrated temples of their faith, and beset by the appeals of a ruined priesthood, began to forget their ancient feud in the common danger, and to stand up against England, as Catholic Ireland, in alliance with Philip. On the other side was England and the Anglo-Protestant colony, together with a minority of the old Norman settlers, for the most part of the established religion,—a power resolved to pursue at any cost a steady policy of subjugation. Thus the old strife in Ireland between the Crown and a rude anarchy, intermingled with that between Norman and Celt, had deepened into a war of two nations and two faiths, in which England and the Protestant Irish were in a league for conquest, and the rest of Ireland, relying on foreign aid, fought fiercely for existence and religion.

Earl Gerald looked on this scene of strife with the eye of a Protestant noble of Elizabeth, and his part was taken and steadily pursued. Once or twice, indeed, on account of his Norman and Celtic connexions, he fell under the suspicion of Elizabeth's deputies; and we are told that in 1580 his son Lord Offaley took refuge among his kinsmen the O'Connors, 'who were ready to rise in arms in his favour.'

But in all the real crisis of the war, he was the faithful soldier and servant of the Crown: he joined in 'hostings against his 'cousin Shane O'Neill;' levied his power 'against the broken 'septs of Lick and Offaley;' was at the disastrous skirmish of Glenmalier; resisted the Spanish invasion at Smerwick, so long remembered for the cruel slaughter of the invaders; and, in the second great peril of the Geraldine race, when the vast domains of the Desmonds were torn from them, and the last Earl of the house was driven out a wanderer, he held fast to the side of England. He died in 1585, and left two sons behind him, who respectively enjoyed their father's honours, and followed in his footsteps: they fought against Hugh O'Neill, in his great rebellion, and died in the service of the Crown. At the close of the sixteenth century, the House of Kildare, no longer dreaming of feudal independence or of allying itself to Celtic Roman Catholics, was represented by a line of Protestant Anglo-Irish nobles, better known in the masques and revels of the great Queen than among their castles of Maynooth and Kilkea.

We must pass rapidly over the next forty years. The line of Gerald, the eleventh Earl, terminated with his two sons, and the House of Kildare was continued through the issue of Lord Edward Fitz-Gerald, the third son of the ninth Earl. Lord Edward was a child in England during the rebellion of Earl Thomas; and he and his descendants became Anglo-Irish and Protestant courtiers connected with England by marriage and education. In 1638, his grandson George had for some time held the title and Irish estates, and was in a very prominent political position; for, besides his rank as premier Earl of Ireland, he had married the daughter of Richard Boyle 'the 'great Earl of Cork.' A dark and troubled era was now opening; dark even in the Irish annals, *atrox pavor, opimum casibus, ipsa pace sævum.* In August 1649, Cromwell landed in Dublin, at the head of an army flushed with repeated triumphs, determined to avenge the massacre of 1641, to put down the dragon of Popery in Ireland, to crush out its worshippers or maintainers, and to plant English Puritanism in a conquered country. The sweep of that destroying host is still visible in the ruins of many a dismantled castle, in the silent sites of towns, now utterly blotted out, and in the names of many a Saxon family, thickly sown over the Irish soil among the other inhabitants, and still marked by the peasant's dislike as Cromwellian. The great majority of the Anglo-Protestant colonists hurried off to the ranks of the invading army, and swelled its triumph over the loyalty and ancient faith of Ireland. The royalist and

Catholic forces resisted for a moment: but resistance was in vain against an army backed by all the strength of England, led by the conquering genius of Cromwell, and filled with the veterans of Naseby and Marston Moor, athirst for spoil and inspired with fanaticism. A year completed such a subjugation as Ireland had never seen: the Puritan sword waved over a desolated land, in which a terrible work had been wrought on the foes of the Lord; and royalists and Catholics, like the Amorites of old, had been placed under ploughs and harrows of iron. After war came a wholesale confiscation, which transferred about one third of the soil from the hands of cavalier and Catholic to those of captains and colonels of the Ironsides; and the mass of the native population, crushed down, outlawed, and insulted, were made hewers of wood and drawers of water for their enemies. This state of Ireland is thus described by a contemporary: 'I can compare it to nothing better than the flinging the reward, on the death of a deer, among a pack of hounds, where every one pulls and tears where he can for himself.'

Perilous and peculiar was the position held by George, Earl of Kildare, in that terrible time. He was a great Irish nobleman, and thus, though a Protestant and a cavalier, he did not escape the levelling despotism of Wentworth, who sent him to prison for opposing the inquiry into defective titles. As a loyalist he was distrusted by the Parliament and the Puritans of England; and although he remained throughout the war opposed to the confederate Catholics, and as late as 1647 was in arms against them, he was instantly deprived of all his commands by Cromwell, and he lost several castles in the course of the invasion. On the other hand, though a Geraldine, he was a Protestant: and so in 1641, when the confederates met at Mullifarnham, he was included in their general proscription, as one 'who, though of the ancient nobility, refused to conform to the Catholic religion;' and in 1647 his great fortress of Maynooth, which had survived the iron arm of Henry VIII., was pillaged and dismantled by them. And yet, though involved in this chaos of peril, the House of Kildare escaped better than most of the royalist families; and when the waves of the deluge subsided, the Restoration found it still planted in the land, still spreading far in its possessions, and still sending forth a scion devoted to the Church of England and the Crown.

In the twenty-eight years which followed the Restoration, there is nothing remarkable in the annals of the House of Kildare. In 1661, Wentworth, the seventeenth Earl, was made a commissioner to carry out the act of settlement; but we have no means of ascertaining his views with regard to that sanction of

Cromwell's confiscations. His son John, was a Protestant courtier of Charles the Second; and appears to have passed his life in England, where possibly he joined in the courtly dissipations of Whitehall, for in 1692 he procured an act for the sale of Adare — a part of the ancient feudal signory. His estates were sequestrated by James's Parliament, when once more, in the name of the House of Stuart, Catholic Ireland rose in arms against the Protestant colony, once more supported by the forces of England; but he seems to have taken no part in the strife; and the House of Kildare was represented in it by his uncle, the Honourable Robert Fitz-Gerald, who took an active part in maintaining the tranquillity of Dublin when the news of the Battle of the Boyne reached the city. The judicious and energetic conduct of this eminent man, at a crisis which had inflamed the passions of both the extreme parties, is another proof that the true friends of Ireland are not those who are to be found in the first ranks of her contending factions, but those who labour to compose their differences. How different might have been the destiny of Ireland, if, in the cruel strife that at this time raged along the ghastly ramparts of Limerick and Londonderry, and upon the bloody fields of Aghrim and Donore, she had possessed many such men as Robert Fitz-Gerald, to mitigate alike the triumph and the defeat, and to abridge a long period of general degradation!

During the period between 1689 and 1753, the House of Kildare flourished through two generations of noble adherents of the Great Revolution. In 1753 the head of the House was James, the twentieth Earl, a man of lofty character and most amiable disposition, adorned by many talents and accomplishments. His lot was cast upon a period of his country's history, when she sate in darkness and the shadow of death; but when, as yet scarce breaking above the horizon, the day-spring of freedom was about to visit her. The Revolution of 1688, so glorious to England, had been ruinous to Ireland in many respects, though at length she has felt the advantage of it. It had repeated the slaughters and confiscations of Cromwell, and had deepened and widened the chasm between Protestant and Catholic Ireland. It had immensely increased the power of the English Parliament, and this had pressed severely on the Irish Protestants, without redressing a single wrong of the subjugated nation. And it had been followed by a penal code against Catholic Ireland which excluded a people from every franchise, office, and learned profession, placed a ban upon the exercise of their religion, forbade the education of their children, interfered with the management of any lands remaining to them,

prohibited their acquiring an acre of freehold estate, and, penetrating into the recesses of domestic life, made children spies on parents, and parents spies on children. How evil were the results of this two-fold injustice, though very different in the degrees of wrong, the first thirty years of the eighteenth century fully attest. In the fine language of the late Mr. Sheil, 'the Irish Protestants knelt to England on the neck of 'Catholic Ireland.' By the sixth of George the First, they were placed in legislative dependence on England. They shared the evil effects of a series of statutes which excluded Ireland from foreign and colonial commerce, from the free export of her own produce, from the right of dealing in her chief manufactures, from the benefits of the Act of Navigation, and from the privilege of purchase in her natural markets. They had a Parliament after the fashion of England, but it was a wretched parody of that of Westminster; for, by a strained construction of Poynings' Statute, the King and Council in England could initiate all its measures, and left it only the right of veto; its House of Lords had no judicial authority, and its House of Commons was made up of nominees of the Crown, or of those of an absentee or dependent nobility, who were elected by a narrow Protestant constituency, and holding their sessions for the Sovereign's life, were uncontrolled by any public opinion. And thus reduced to insignificance in the State, the Protestants of Ireland experienced the fate of a colonial oligarchy, entirely subject to the mother country, and deriving no support from the masses beneath them. They gradually lost their civil and social importance; were governed through England by Englishmen, were regularly excluded from all important offices, and secluded among the territories their ancestors had won, they degenerated for the most part into an insolent and uncultivated caste. In exchange, however, for the loss of their natural position, they retained the ignoble, and now unprofitable, monopoly of tyrannising over the Popish enemy, of insulting the few relics of the Sarsfields and the O'Neills at county meetings, sessions, and assizes; and of pressing down the yoke of a monstrous bondage upon the ancient Celtic population.

As for Catholic Ireland at this period, it was formally outlawed in all the relations of life, and had sunk down in hopeless and miserable servitude. The war of 1688 had effaced any lingering difference between the Catholics of the Pale and those of the 'mere Irish,' and the Penal Code was impartial in oppressing the two races. Its terrors made a few proselytes, but religious intolerance scorns a convert, and the Irish Catholics who conformed to the dominant faith were despised like the

Nuovo Christianos of Spain. The bolder spirits among them, of either race, preferred the chances of exile abroad to the certainty of humiliation at home; and occasionally, at the head of a faithful following, they appeared at any court or camp in Europe that wanted recruits against Protestant England. Under the lily flag of the house of Bourbon they avenged their wrongs upon the retreating host of Landen, upon the victorious squadrons of Marlborough at Blenheim, and upon the reeling column at Fontenoy. They were to be found in the cabinet of Alberoni, under the standards of Spain in the last century, at the head of regiments of Austria and Russia, 'always faithful,'* as their banners named them, to the foes of England, extorting from George the Second at Dettingen a bitter tribute to their valour; and however isolated or separated from each other, to be known by a lasting freemasonry of hatred! The few of them that remained were involved in the general fate; and the people of Catholic Ireland, deprived of their natural leaders, shut out from the pale of the British constitution, and trampled on by an alien oligarchy of invaders, settled down upon the land they had once possessed, or betook themselves to a precarious commerce, with few hopes but that afforded by their persecuted faith, with a barbarous agriculture as their principal pursuit—a numerous and degraded helotry, whom Swift compared to 'Irish swine.'

Towards the middle of the last century, however, there were signs of a change in this general degradation. Miserable as the government of Ireland had been, the cessation from war, the establishment of law, and the absence of violence and spoliation, had made her condition very different from that which it had been in 1688. The increase of wealth among the Irish Protestants, the ideas of civil rights they necessarily acquired from the sight of the settled freedom of England, and the enlightenment caused by the spread of education, gradually created among them a party of opposition to the rule of the English Cabinet in Ireland. When, to use the words of Edmund Burke, 'the English in Ireland had become domiciliated, and began to re-collect they had a country,' it almost followed that an Irish party would array itself against the domineering English officials who held a monopoly of place and power in Ireland. The signs of this party first appeared as early as 1724-5, when Swift aroused a resistance to England in the affair of Wood's patent for coining. But it was undeveloped till 1749, when the struggle

* 'Semper et ubicunque fideles' was the motto upon the standards of the Irish Brigade.

of Lucas with Lord Harrington, with regard to the franchises of the Dublin corporation, and the strong public feeling that struggle excited, revealed its power and Anti-English tendencies. From this time it gathered into its ranks several of the chiefs of the Protestant Irish aristocracy; it established itself firmly in the Irish Parliament; and became known as the 'patriot' Irish party, in opposition to the government or 'English' interest. At first, true to the principles of the Revolution, of which, indeed, it was the posthumous offspring, it denied the claim of Catholic Ireland to any social or political amelioration; and confined its objects to the emancipation of the Irish Protestants from political bondage and commercial restraints. Its earlier leaders, Lucas, Boyle and Malone, seem never to have thought that within their country there existed an ancient race, kept down in servitude, whose aid might have given weight to their struggle for independence; and hence, to the wisest of that race, they appeared a petulant clique in a tyrant oligarchy. 'Those boasters, the Whigs of Ireland, are in search of liberty 'just as Herod was of Christ, to crush it in its infancy,' was the unjust taunt, in 1749, of one of the founders of the first Catholic Association. But the advocacy of just principles of government, the gradual decay of intolerant opinions, and the sense of its weakness without popular support, slowly led the patriotic party in Ireland to extend assistance to the fallen Catholic nation, and to claim for it some of the rights of British subjects. The increase of the Catholics in numbers, and in wealth, contributed to this tardy result, and at length the descendant of the Revolution approached its victim, and sought to bring it within the sanctuary of the British constitution. Towards the close of the eighteenth century, the successors of the men who at first had only striven for the rights of an Irish sect, constituted the modern Whig party of Ireland, and, in alliance with Fox, Sheridan, and Burke, they redeemed the debt due from ancestral bigotry, by a noble struggle for Catholic emancipation against the intolerance of a king and an empire. Even in the corrupt and feeble Parliament of Ireland that party, bright with illustrious names, and at length substituting for the Puritan principles of the Revolution the nobler principle enunciated by Grattan, 'that the Irish Protestant could never be free, until the Irish Catholic should cease to be a slave,' had gained for Catholic Ireland the right of possessing property in peace, the right of acquiring property of any description, and the privilege of voting for members of Parliament. That party, transferred to the Imperial Parliament, coalesced naturally with the great Whig party of England, and for nearly thirty

years the august alliance fought the arduous battle of Catholic Ireland against a powerful and vehement opposition. To that cause a generation of British and Irish statesmen sacrificed every reward of a just ambition, and every prospect of power and place: but, although it was not their fortune to give Catholic Ireland the full fruition of civil and religious freedom,—although this triumph is due in part to herself, and in part to the graceless concessions of her foes,—Catholic Ireland should never forget what she owes to that noble list of disinterested men who, extending the principles of the Revolution to a race long thought unworthy to receive them, and really establishing the faith of their ancestors while seeming to act against its precepts, were at least her conductors to the promised land through a long wilderness of trial and privation.

It is the just boast of the Kildare Geraldines, that they have always belonged to this Irish section of the Whig party. James, Earl of Kildare, was its principal leader in 1753. He had had a large experience of parliamentary life, having sat in the Irish House of Commons from 1741 to 1744, and having obtained a seat in the English House of Peers in 1747. He was besides the brother-in-law of Henry Fox, and had acquired a large and merited popularity from the kindness of his manners and disposition. It was in 1753 that the Irish patriot party began its first real struggle with the English interest in Ireland. Four years before, the Irish House of Commons had omitted to insert in the preamble of a bill for appropriating a surplus to the national debt that the assent of the Crown had been previously obtained. The Privy Council in England insisted on the insertion: but although, as Mr. Hallam observes, there ought to have been no doubt as to the control of a House of Commons over a surplus, the Irish Commons passed the altered bill without a word of complaint. In 1753, however, the same amendment was attempted in a money bill of the same description; and the patriot Irish party, now firmly organised and supported by many of the Irish nobility, broke out into a vehement opposition. The leaders of the English interest at the time were George Stone, the Primate, once Bishop of Derry, and Lord George Sackville, the Chief Secretary, son of the Duke of Dorset, who afterwards acquired an unenviable notoriety. Stone was known to possess a violent temper, and was suspected of the most execrable vices; and Lord George was young, and overbearing in his language. On the other hand, the leaders of the Irish Whigs were the Earl of Kildare, Boyle, the Speaker of the House of Commons, and Anthony Malone, all men of recognised talents and probity. The moment was

thus favourable for opposition; and a fierce struggle upon the point at issue was maintained between the contending parties. At length the cause of constitutional right was successful; the Irish House of Commons was permitted to appropriate its surplus, and a blow was given to the English interest in Ireland from which it never entirely recovered. For though the subject of dispute was not very momentous, it brought to a head the various elements of discontent which had been at work in Protestant Ireland, and it revealed the strength of the patriot party. Nor were its immediate consequences unimportant. The power of the Irish House of Commons was so greatly increased that the value of a seat in it was suddenly trebled, and the cunning and practised Bubb Dodington seems to have feared that it would declare its independence. The leaders of the patriotic party became so powerful that the Crown was unable to resist them. In 1755 the Lord Lieutenant was recalled, and the name of Primate Stone was struck from the list of the Privy Council. The spirit of Protestant Ireland was thoroughly aroused, and displayed itself in various violent demonstrations; and the year 1753 was long remembered by the Irish Whigs as the commencement of their political existence.

The Earl of Kildare gained great popularity in Ireland for having led the Whigs in this opposition to England. In 1753 he addressed a memorial to George II. on the subject, which gives a clear account of the system of misgovernment in Ireland under a packed Parliament, and 'a duumvirate like Strafford and Laud.' For this he incurred the vehement censure of Government, and the Lord Lieutenant angrily wrote to the Primate, that but for its mildness such an act might have been full of danger. Lord Kildare tells us with just pride how his ancestor became the idol of Protestant Ireland on this occasion; how on the 16th of November, 1753, he was an hour making his way through the shouting crowds from College Green to Kildare House; and how a medal was struck as a record of memorial, on which the Earl was represented as guarding a heap of money from a hand, with the motto, 'Touch not, says Kildare.' But though he remained a short time in disgrace at St. James's, he was made Lord Justice in 1756, and he subsequently filled several important offices in the State. In 1761 he exchanged his earldom for a marquisate; and in 1766 he became the first Duke of Leinster; but, through all the phases of Irish politics he steadily continued at the head of the patriot party. We have not, however, been able to ascertain his views upon several questions of public importance which were discussed in Ireland in the seventeen years after 1753; and can

only conjecture that, with regard to the first protest which in 1757 Catholic Ireland made against the Penal Code; with regard to Mr. Mason's bill in 1763, to enable Papists to lend money on mortgage;—and with regard to Lucas's two bills in the same year, to limit the duration of Parliaments to seven years, and to reduce the pensions on the Irish establishment—he was probably on the side of justice and good government.

We see him, however, more plainly in 1771^o, still at the head of the Irish Whig party, in a crisis of much importance at the time, but now remembered chiefly from the sketches of *Baratariana*. During the period between 1753 and 1767, the Parliament of Ireland had acquired a significance unknown in the first fifty years of the century. The House of Peers had increased in wealth and numbers, and had derived strength from the growing importance of the nation. The House of Commons had ceased to be an echo of the Castle; the English interest in it had become very small, and it had a really independent party. But the power of the Whig aristocracy had increased within it; they had the nomination of many of its members, and, although it had been of real use to Protestant Ireland, it was full of the various weaknesses and corruptions inseparable from a large assembly not responsible to the people. It was just at this time that, upon the fall of the Rockingham Whigs in England, George the Third put together that coalition of 'the king's friends,' which, beginning under the nominal presidency of Chatham, maintained under different forms a long life of ignominy. The object of this coalition was to break down the influence of the Whig families everywhere, and to illustrate the rule of a patriot king, by governing without regard to party by bribery and intimidation. Accordingly in Ireland, as in England, it set about its work; and in 1767 it made Lord Townshend its Lord Lieutenant. This nobleman, the Sancho of *Baratariana*, was naturally an amiable and convivial soldier; but he proved himself an efficient agent in carrying out his employer's objects. He detached their followers from the Whigs by wholesale corruption, restored an English interest in College Green, and, in a short time, could boast of the obsequiousness of the Irish Parliament. And when the patriotic Irish party had thus been weakened, he revealed the true nature of one of 'the king's friends' by such an attack upon the parliamentary constitution of Ireland as had not been attempted for a long period.

Accordingly in 1769, under colour of the old statute of Sir Edward Poyning's, Lord Townshend caused a money bill to be introduced into the Irish House of Commons, which had ori-

ginated with the King in council in England under a certificate of the Irish Privy Council. Such a step was undoubtedly within the law, for the right of the King in council to initiate *all* Irish legislation had long been declared the import of the statute; but it seems to have been without a precedent, and it struck at the highest privilege of a House of Commons. After a debate which revealed the new-born strength of the English interest, the Irish Commons threw out the Bill upon the grounds 'that it had not arisen in their House;' and it is certain that this course was quite constitutional, since no construction of Sir Edward Poynings' statute had ever deprived them of the right to a veto.* But the vote excited the greatest indignation at the Castle because it had assigned the reason of the rejection; and Lord Townshend and the House of Commons were brought at once into collision. Following the evil, but not uncongenial example of Strafford, he attempted to place a protest against the vote upon the Commons' Journals, but the House was not yet in a fitting temper for submission. He recorded his protest, however, upon the Journals of the House of Lords, though not without a spirited counter-protest from some of the peers, and immediately afterwards he prorogued the Parliament for two years. The interval was spent by the Lord Lieutenant in corrupting the House of Commons to such an extent as Ireland had hitherto never seen, and by the Whigs in organising a resistance to the torrent of bribery. In this service the Duke of Leinster greatly distinguished himself; and for it he is affectionately mentioned in Baratariana as

'Brave Leinster, our patron, whom nought can affright.'

The unscrupulous agencies, however, brought to bear upon a Senate that had no real dependence upon the people, that was bitterly characterised at this time as 'existing by a charter of submission, and annihilated as soon as it became the servant of the public,' were too powerful for the Whig party. In 1771 a formal vote of the Irish Parliament gave a direct sanction to all Lord Townshend's conduct, and, in the words of a contemporary observer, 'the Parliament of Ireland became as obsequious as that of England.' The vote of 1771, however, was immediately followed by a protest from the Duke of Leinster and sixteen other peers, against the continuance of Lord Townshend in office; and Ponsonby, the Speaker of the House of Commons, resigned his place, to the great regret of all parties.

* This was the last public act of the first Duke of Leinster. He did not live to see his party revive under the rule of Lord North; and, gathering strength from England's weakness at the

close of the American war, extort freedom of commerce and of legislation for Ireland. He did not witness the first alliance of the Irish Whigs with Catholic Ireland, nor the first relaxation of the Penal Code. He did not behold the brief and delusive glory of his country under an independent legislature, nor mourn over its auspicious eclipse at the Union. He died in 1773, still in the vigour of life, transmitting his title and estates to his son, and thence to a grandson, who still adheres to the political faith of his ancestor, and fitly represents his illustrious House. This volume closes with the life of the first Duke, and we shall not attempt to outrun its limits. But we could have wished to have said something of the second Duke of Leinster, the friend of Fox and Grattan—the leader of the Irish Whigs—the enlightened supporter of Catholic Emancipation and Reform—the tried and steadfast servant of his King in evil days, when loyalty in the Head of the Geraldines involved a cruel sacrifice of personal affection. And we could have wished to have added a word upon the brilliant valour, the heroic nature, and the many accomplishments of the ill-fated Lord Edward Fitz-Gerald, whom, in the blinding chaos of a revolutionary time, the aspect of his country's accumulated wrongs, and a wild but disinterested desire to remove them, hurried along the dark path that leads to anarchy and ruin. ‘*Nos vero taceamus de istis ne augeamus dolorem ;*’ and, thanking Lord Kildare for this interesting work, we commend it cordially to our readers.

ART. VII. — *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, D.C.L., M.P. for the University of Oxford. 3 vols. Oxford: 1858.

IF the exalted character and position of the eminent man who has given these volumes to the public render it extremely difficult for the critic to deal with them as becomes the importance of the task, that difficulty is incalculably increased by the peculiar nature of the work itself. A more attractive composition, on the one hand, so far as taste and feeling are concerned; one more unsatisfactory, on the other, as a critical essay, the product of accurate learning; it is scarcely possible to imagine. Under the first point of view, the volumes well deserve the great admiration, not to say enthusiasm, which they have excited, especially among younger and fresher readers; but, in their learned aspect, we cannot regard them as anything but monuments of ingenuity wastefully expended; and, as usual in such cases and with such writers, the cleverest parts are precisely the most unconvincing.

For what to us appear the greatest defects of the work, are most evidently the products of the writer's own peculiar turn and temper. We do not, therefore, speak here of such imperfections as result from mere inadequacy of execution. It is easy to show, what most readers will soon ascertain without need of proof, that the work is a great deal too long; that its lengthiness is rather the result of hasty workmanship than of fulness of erudition, the author having evidently bestowed much pains on parts, very little on the finish of the whole; that repetitions and contradictions abound to the most perplexing extent. These are the common defects of a writer deeply busied in other employments, who consecrates the mere moments of his leisure to the worship of a jealous idol, which requires, and deserves, years of exclusive study. To solve the great Homeric problems may require faculties far inferior to those of a Gladstone, but it demands the exclusive devotion of those faculties. But of imperfections of this class, having once adverted to them, we say no more. We turn to those qualities which are, as we have said, characteristic of the author, — elements both of his strength and his weakness — his fiery rhetoric, his captivating enthusiasm, his nobleness and purity of thought, combined with an innate tendency to the sophistical in reasoning, and, as some have suspected, with that radical deficiency in the faculty of imagination which makes him

throughout rather collect truths by induction, than conceive and realise them; rather arrive, by more or less subtle reasoning, at more or less plausible conclusions, than embody great perceptions with that power of divination which constitutes the genius of a Niebuhr or a Gibbon.

If we were to analyse the general, though unsifted, notions which the majority of scholarlike Englishmen at the present day entertain of the text of Homer, we should probably find them reducible into something like this shape: That the great German onslaught on the integrity of the text, conducted by Wolf, Hermann, Lachmann, and the other critical champions of the last generation, has failed; but failed less because the strength of the fortress has become more manifest, than because many weak demonstrations of the assailing force have been successfully repulsed. The unity of each poem remains the most probable supposition, and commands the most general assent. The common authorship of both is a proposition less generally accepted; yet still the inclination of most students would be in favour of it. But beyond this, Homeric orthodoxy in general does not go. Few of us are disposed to face the array of external evidence which proclaims that the text was handed down in fragments from remote antiquity; that those fragments were cast and recast, stitched together, unstitched again, handled by uncritical and unscrupulous compilers in every possible way; that in the best age of Greece there were many received texts of the poet—many manuscripts distinguished by the name of particular cities; the amount of variation which they may have exhibited being now wholly undiscoverable. Few can shut their eyes to the fact that the internal texture of the poems corresponds exactly with what external tradition would lead us to expect; that they are full of startling omissions, apparent interpolations, insoluble contradictions, and occasional inconsequence of plan and motive. And we hold it a fit exercise of the critical faculty, though a very difficult one, to try to 'divaricate' true from false, and to mark, at least as probable, what we 'conceive to be un-Homeric, interpolated, or altered.'

Examining a little closer, we find that the view taken of the controversy respecting Homeric unity mainly depends on the starting point from which men set out: whether they conceive the *onus probandi* to lie on the side which denies the unity, or that which affirms it. The former was the received view in times when criticism was young and careless. It was tacitly assumed that there was no difference in this respect between Homer and other writers; that the presumption from external evidence was always in favour of the received text; and that

arguments to the contrary, from internal evidence, laboured under the disadvantage arising from that presumption. It was Bentley, we suspect, who first clearly saw that the presumption was the other way. If there were no internal evidence in the case—if the whole question turned on traditional authority—we could have no confidence whatever in the received text; for the uniform tale told by antiquity is, that the Homeric poems were collected and put together by rhapsodists, who were reputed far from scrupulous in their mode of performing the task. Under such circumstances, as Professor Blackie strongly puts it, 'if they had not been pieced, it would be nothing short of miraculous.' Therefore the internal arguments in favour of unity are against, not supported by, the external presumption. This is a fundamental distinction of the highest importance. For if we know, *aliunde*, that a work is authentic, then arguments to the contrary from internal inconsistencies are idle. But if we believe, *aliunde*, that the work has been altered and interpolated, then even very small inconsistencies afford arguments of weight in favour of that belief. Now, this different mode of viewing the question appears to us to constitute the main distinction between the line of argument taken by Mr. Gladstone and Colonel Mure on the one hand, and on the other by Mr. Grote, and all the modern German school of temperate scepticism which has succeeded to the first impetuosity of the Wolfian faction.

It is better, however, that we should propound Mr. Gladstone's line of argument, at least in the first instance, in his own words:—

'Let us now proceed to consider the question, what assumption is it, on the whole, safest to make, or what rule can we most judiciously follow, as our guide in Homeric studies, with reference to the text of the poems? Shall we adopt a given form of completely reconstructed text, like that of Payne Knight? Shall we, without such adherence to a particular pattern, assume it to be either indisputable, or at least most probable, that an extensive corruption of the text can hardly have been avoided; and shall we, in consequence, hold the received text provisionally, and subject to excision or to amendment according to any particular theory concerning Homer, his age, its manners and institutions, which we may ourselves have thought fit to follow or construct?

'Shall we admit as authoritative the excisions of Aristarchus or the Alexandrian critics, and the *obeli* which he has placed against verses which he suspected?

'Or shall we proceed, as a general rule, upon the belief that the received text of Homer is in general sound and trustworthy, so far, at least, as to be very greatly preferable to any reconstructed or altered

form whatever, in which it has hitherto been produced or proposed for our acceptance?

'My decided preference is for the fourth and last of these alternatives: with the observation, however, in passing, that the third does not essentially differ from it with respect to the great body of the poems, so far as we know what the Alexandrian text really was.'

'I prefer this course as by far the safest: as the only one which can be entered upon with such an amount of preliminary assent, as to secure a free and unbiassed consideration of Homeric questions upon a ground held in common; and as, therefore, the only one, by means of which it can be hoped to attain to solid and material results as the reward of inquiry. In order fairly to raise the issue, the two following propositions may be stated as fitting canons of Homeric study:—

'1. That we should adopt the text itself as the basis of all Homeric inquiry, and not any preconceived theory, nor any arbitrary standard of criticism, referable to the particular periods, schools, or persons.

'2. That as we proceed in any work of construction by evidence drawn from the text, we should avoid the temptations to solve difficulties found to lie in our way, by denouncing particular portions of it as corrupt or interpolated: should never set it aside except upon the closest examination of the particular passage questioned: should use sparingly the liberty even of arraying presumptions against it; and should always let the reader understand both when and why it is questioned.' (Vol. i. p. 42.)

Now we admit that these canons read plausibly enough; it is not till within a very near reach of the whirlpool, that the unsuspecting reader is likely to perceive the danger towards which Mr. Gladstone's ingenious way of putting the case is hurrying him.

For his reasoning amounts to this, and very logically does he follow it out:—The orthodox theory is more probable, on the whole, than any other constructive theory; more probable than the Wolfian counter-theory; *à fortiori*, more probable than the merely destructive suppositions of Hermann and Lachmann. The orthodox text rests on better ground than any particular amended text; than the obelisms of Aristarchus, or those of Payne Knight, or those of any other conjectural critic, ancient or modern. Therefore it is 'safest' to assume both the received theory and text. Therefore, having assumed them, I lay aside all liberty of criticism and examination; for things assumed must be regarded, for the purpose of ulterior criticism, as things proved. Therefore (we are giving his spirit, not his words) I shall take every part of the text equally (or with one or two desperate exceptions only) as genuine, and trustworthy for the purposes of criticism and argument. I waive all questions regarding genuineness. I reject altogether for myself,

and I condemn emphatically in others, 'the dangerous and seductive practice' of noting particular passages as spurious.

Now this, in plain language, may look well on paper, but can convince no one. Arguments as to the theology, history, manners, geography, of the Homeric age, founded on the assumption that the received Homeric text is all equally genuine, are essentially unreal. It will not do to assume the text as a fixed thing, merely because it is convenient — *è pur si muove* is the inevitable response of the intellect. Lawyers in controversy may waive questions as to the genuineness of a document, because their object is the advantage of their clients, which may be attained by mutual concession; historians in controversy cannot, because their object is truth. To act otherwise, would be to turn (as Mr. Gladstone does) a rule of convenience into a rule of faith.

We remember a recent controversy of much the same kind, and in which we endeavoured on our own parts to enforce as far as in us lay the same principle as now. There can be no reasonable doubt that the text of Shakspeare, as given in the first folio, is incorrect and corrupt. But, for the most part, have no means of amending the errors, except by sheer conjecture. Sheer conjecture is worthless: it is only one man's guess against another's. Bad as the text is, no amendment of it rests on any authority equal to itself. Therefore — concluded a certain school of critics, Mr. Charles Knight at their head — because it is convenient to abide by the first folio, therefore we are bound to abide by it. And therefore all Shaksperian criticism, founded on any doubt of the genuineness of the folio texts, is heterodox. Now, putting Homer for Shakspeare, we really have, in this singular *paralogism*, an almost accurate counterpart of the leading principle of criticism which runs through 'Homer and the Homeric Age.'

In order more definitely to illustrate our meaning, let us take some of the internal evidence most commonly adduced, by sceptical critics, in support of the external probability that the text in its present shape is corrupt, and note the consequences in their bearing on the Gladstonian argument. The first ordinary proof to this effect is taken from the inconsistencies of the narrative, especially in the *Iliad*.* We say this, in full

* We confine ourselves to the *Iliad* for the purpose of clearness. But we make frank concession to Mr. Gladstone and those who think with him, of the propositions, that the internal arguments against the unity of the *Odyssey* are far weaker than those against the unity of the *Iliad*; and that the unity of the *Odyssey*, if established, is the strongest of external arguments in favour of that of the *Iliad*.

recollection of Colonel Mure's paradoxes on the subject; of his curious notion that the *Iliad* contains no anomalies: 'which cannot be proved, by internal evidence, to originate in a corresponding anomaly of the genius of a single poet;' of his ingenious parallels, to show that similar self-contradictions may be found in Virgil. In the first place, the cases are not parallel: the instances which criticism may elicit from Virgil are of a very different calibre from those which force themselves on our notice in Homer. 'But if they were parallel, the argument from Virgil to Homer would be very inconclusive; because, as above said, the fundamental presumption is different. If two different versions of the same story are brought us, we conclude—not as morally certain, but as probable—that they proceed originally from different men. Nay, says Colonel Mure, but you have no right to such conclusion; for I will show you a man who has told a story in two different ways. The fallacy of the answer is evident; it might confute the dogmatist, it does not touch the reasoner on probabilities.

1. Critics all observe, and none can solve, the strange circumstance that all the fighting from the eleventh to the eighteenth book of the *Iliad*, inclusive, — from the ἀπέρτεια of Agamemnon to the repulse of the Trojans from the wall after the death of Patroclus,—takes place in one uninterrupted day. The reader who happens to be unfamiliar with the subject will find it discussed in Heyne's *Excursus* on books xi. and xii.: but Heyne does not state the whole case; for half the day is already over at the 86th line of the eleventh book, when, we are told, the fight, hitherto uncertain, began to incline at noon in favour of the Greeks. Now this, to speak plainly, is utterly irreconcilable with the supposition of an uncorrupted text. As Heyne, who fights for the letter as well as he can, honestly remarks: 'Quâ tamen negantem ac recusantem in partes meas pertraham, haud video.' In truth, such neglect of an essential particular contradicts the very characteristic of truthfulness which we all (and especially Mr. Gladstone) attribute to the old bard. There is therefore only one solution. The rhapsodists have performed their office ill. Sewing together, inartificially, the leaves of the *Iliad*, they have omitted or misplaced some connecting fragment. There has been loss, or addition, or both. It may very possibly be the case that the error, could we detect it, would prove but an immaterial one; that it affects neither the genuineness of the text in the main, nor the poetical fitness of the work. But it is a gross error notwithstanding. The text has been tampered with; and, if tampered with to any extent, who can say to what extent? What is the use of

commonplace assertions of its general soundness, in the face of distinct proof of its defectiveness in some plain particular? Strange to say, Mr. Gladstone never adverts at all, so far as we have found, to difficulties of this narrow but perplexing class.

2. As an instance of structural difficulty of a more serious order, because involving not merely accuracy of narrative, but accuracy of plot and character, and of Mr. Gladstone's way of dealing with it, we would refer to the much disputed question of the authenticity of the ninth book of the *Iliad* (the embassy to Achilles). This difficulty Mr. Gladstone by no means omits: on the contrary, he endeavours to solve it at length; but by arguments which appear to us not merely inconclusive in themselves, but tainted with the fundamental vice of his reasoning. The main objection, briefly stated, is this: In the ninth book, Agamemnon tenders Achilles acknowledgment of his wrong, and ample reparation, which Achilles sternly though politely declines. Agamemnon's ambassadors return to the camp unsuccessful, and the calamities of the following books overtake the Greeks. In the sixteenth book, Achilles at length permits Patroclus to aid his countrymen; but on what terms, and with what object? Expressly that he may procure the humiliation of Agamemnon, the repentance of the Grecian leaders, and honour and substantial gratification, ἀγλαα δῶρα, for him, Achilles. Not one word of allusion to the fact that Agamemnon had been already humbled, that the Greeks had already repented; that compensation, admitted to be full, had already been tendered; that the continuance of the breach was owing to the obstinacy of Achilles himself, and that alone. Achilles, in short, here begins his career of return and reconciliation, as from a new starting point altogether; and the sixteenth book absolutely ignores the ninth.

Such is the argument developed in the note to Mr. Grote's twenty-first chapter, which leaves nothing to be desired for fullness and cogency, and which we would have transferred to our own pages, for greater clearness, had space admitted. What is Mr. Gladstone's answer? That the apparent inconsistency is in accordance with the dramatic character of Achilles. Achilles, he says, (vol. iii. p. 368-378.) was not satisfied with the first offers of Agamemnon, because, though abundant in the way of compensation, they were not accompanied by any formal admission that he, Agamemnon, had been in the wrong! Now, we will not discuss with so great a master of Parliamentary Etiquette the ethical question, whether such niceties of the fencing-school were likely to be present in the mind of Achilles; we will allow it to be dramatically probable that the hero was

in the position of a plaintiff who, having had a tender of costs and damages, stands out for an apology: which, be it observed by the way, Achilles never gets after all. But this is no answer at all to Mr. Grote: in Oxford phrase, it is an 'ignoratio elenchi.' Mr. Grote objects, not to the supposed moral inconsistency in Achilles, but to the structural inconsistency in the poem. The motive attributed to Achilles by Mr. Gladstone *may* be the true one: but why does not Homer say so? Why does he leave Mr. Gladstone to bring the truth out, having pumped it up with difficulty—for, says he, 'it takes time to sound the depths of Homer!' The objection is, that there is a great and staring lacuna between the Achilles of the ninth book and him of the sixteenth: the answer is, that the lacuna may be filled up by the application of conjecture on moral probabilities. This will hardly do. After hearing all Mr. Gladstone's rhetoric, the judicial mind is still thrown back on the irresistible belief, that there is some latent error: either the ninth book is spurious, which would be a very unwelcome solution, or some connecting link has perished in the dislocations which the middle part of the Iliad has evidently undergone. We need hardly say, that it is by no means necessary to resort to Mr. Grote's violent supposition of the double poem—the Achilleis and the Ilias—which we agree with Mr. Gladstone in rejecting.

3. To pass to another class of difficulties, namely, those arising out of the supposed interpolation of minor and distinct passages: here, again, we meet with the same hard crystallised orthodoxy in Mr. Gladstone. His position evidently is—If the genuineness of a passage cannot be disproved—and how is this possible?—it is rash to doubt about it: and waste of materials to neglect it, when we want it for the purpose of an argument. For the intermediate state of mind—the habitual half-light of the sceptic, the modified opinion which dares not erase a passage for want of sufficient ground, yet shrinks from relying on it as the basis of reasoning—he seems either to have no natural capacity, or else purposely to discard it. We have only noticed one considerable fragment which even he expunges from the canon; namely, the second *νεκρῖα*, in the last book of the Odyssey; and, comparing it with other suspected passages, we really hardly know why.

On this basis of strict textual accuracy all the main arguments of these argumentative volumes are constituted. The inconclusive, not to say illusory, character of the premisses reacts on the conclusion. Where we admire most, we are least persuaded: reasonings intended to drive home conviction to our minds seem to reach them with no momentum, and waste their power in the

air; while, on the other hand, we are constantly struck with the refined ingenuity of incidental portions, and with the deep sense of poetical beauty, and Homeric beauty in particular, which they manifest. We must pass over the historical and ethnological portion of these researches with this brief comment. In Mr. Gladstone's general conclusions — that Homer lived within a generation or two of the Trojan War; that his general aim is historical; that he is an authority, and a trustworthy authority, as to Greek history and ethnology; that in this latter research especially 'the extraordinary sureness and precision of the mind of Homer stand us in admirable stead; wherever, amidst the cloud and chaps of pre-Homeric antiquity, he enables us to discern a luminous point, that point is a beacon, and indicates ground on which we may tread with confidence,' we acquiesce, as reasonably likely. But we cannot concur in the dogmatic boldness with which they are laid down; still less in the hair-splitting refinements by which they are too frequently supported. But for these important discussions we have not space. We prefer to fix our minds — partly with a view to the more close illustration of the Gladstonian method, partly for indulgence in certain favourite dreams of our own — on that separate portion of his work in which he dwells on the Homeric geography.

This is chiefly dealt with in three ingenious chapters: book ii. sec. 4., 'on the Phœnicians, and the Outer Geography' of the *Odyssey*; sec. 5., on the Catalogue; and book iii. section 4., 'Thalassa, or the Outer Geography,' which, somewhat inartificially, repeats in the third volume a good deal of the argument on this subject already used in the second. Mr. Gladstone's main positions are, that Homer was intimately and personally acquainted with Grecian topography within a certain limit, which he endeavours to fix in the curious map appended to his third volume; that beyond that limit his knowledge was derived from Phœnician report, and mixed with legendary lore. The following is the forcible language in which he lays down the first canon of his inquiry.

'Nowhere is Homer's precision more remarkable, than in the numerous passages where he appears before us as a real topographer or geographer. Indeed by virtue of this accuracy, he enables us to define with considerable confidence the sphere of his knowledge and experience: by which I mean, not only the countries and places he had visited, but those with respect to which he had habitual information from his countrymen, and unrestricted opportunities of correcting error. In the direction of the west, it seems plain that he knew nothing except the coast of Greece and the coastward islands. Phœncia (Scheria?) hangs doubtfully upon his horizon, and it is probable that

he had only a very general idea of its position. Towards the north there is nothing to imply that his experimental knowledge reached beyond the Thracian coast, and at the farthest the sea of Marmora. He speaks of Ida as if its roots and spurs comprised the whole district, of which in that quarter he could speak with confidence. To the east, he probably knew the regions beyond Lycia on the coast of Asia Minor: and to the south, Crete was probably his boundary: though he was aware, by name at least, of the leading geographical points of a maritime passage not wholly unfrequented, to the almost unknown regions of Cyprus, Phœnicia, and Egypt. . . . While he is within that circle, he is studious alike of the distances between places, the forms of country, and the physical character of different districts; but when he passes beyond it, he emancipates himself from the laws of space. The points touched in the voyage of Ulysses are wholly irreconcilable with actual geography, though national partialities have endeavoured to identify them with a view to particular appropriation. Some of them, indeed, we may conceive that he mentally associated with places that had been described to him; nay, he may have intended it in all; but the dislocated knowledge which alone even the navigators of the age would possess, has suffered, by intent or accident, such farther derangement in its transfer to the mind of Homer, that it is hopeless to adjust his geography otherwise than by a *free and large infusion of fictitious drawing*. This outer sphere is however peopled with imagery of deep interest. For the purposes of the poem the whole of the wanderings both of Menelaus and Ulysses lie within it, and beyond the limits of ordinary Greek experience. And throughout these wanderings the language of Homer is that of a poet who, as to facts, was at the mercy of unsifted information: of information which he must either receive from a source not liable to check and scrutiny, or else not receive at all: and who wisely availed himself of that character of the marvellous with which the whole was inspired, to work it up into pictures of the imagination, which were to fill both his cotemporaries and all succeeding generations with emotions of interest and wonder.' (Vol. i. p. 217-19.)

Everyone concurs in this encomium on the accuracy of Homer as a topographer within his own local knowledge; but our estimate differs widely from that of Mr. Gladstone as to the extent which that local knowledge can be shown to have reached. What real evidence does either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* afford that the author had the slightest acquaintance with the interior of Northern Greece, or the Peloponnesus, or many even of the principal islands? that he was personally familiar with the site of any one of the famous Grecian cities whose melodious names so frequently recur in his verse? Impartial criticism, we believe, must answer, No kind of evidence whatever but one — the appropriate and characteristic epithets by which places are described, and especially in the Catalogue. The fitness of these epithets all admire. All feel that they must have

been originally bestowed by eye-witnesses. But what is the evidence that Homer was the original inventor? Let us hear, on this subject, one of our newly-retained classical tourists, Mr. Clark, in his 'Peloponnesus;' who, though somewhat too much addicted to a passion for smart writing, is a good scholar, and thinks for himself. After puzzling over one or two of the known enigmas of those Homeric descriptions which seem to Mr. Gladstone "so clear — the whereabouts of Dulichium, the site of Ithaca, the impossible distance from Phœæ to Sparta — he hazards the following conclusions:—

'I give these as a sample of the dilemmas out of which those critics must extricate themselves who insist upon making Homer the father of geography as well as poetry' But, it may be said, how can we deny the authority of Homer in matters of geography, while we admit the beautiful appropriateness of his epithets; the "walled" Tiryns, the "grassy" Haliartus, "horse-feeding" Argos, "sandy" Pylos, and "hollow" Lacedæmon? This is the very inconsistency which Strabo charges upon Eratosthenes. The inconsistency, if such there be, is not in the critic who observes it, but in the poet himself. Sometimes the story and the language are in strict accordance with the observed facts of geography and topography; sometimes in striking contradiction. Here is a difficulty which we may, or may not, be able to account for: we certainly never shall account for it, unless, in the first instance, we frankly admit its existence and magnitude. . . .

'How then, it may be asked, do we find so many cities of Greece always mentioned each with its own characteristic and descriptive adjective If there were brave men before Agamemnon, so before Homer there lived and sang many minstrels in Greece. Each city had its own heroes and legends, and its own bards to celebrate them. A multitude of smaller epics have been absorbed in the Iliad and the Odyssey, and the epithets attached inalienably to this city and that, are among the relics of those perished songs. And the audience required no more.' (*Peloponnesus*, p. 206.)

In this view we certainly agree. We hold with Professor Blackie, that it is a far easier thing — in the absence of proof either way — to believe that Homer 'constructed the Iliad out of the rich materials of traditionary song,' than out of nothing. We hold this a safer mode of accounting for his personality than to esteem him, as Mr. Gladstone seems to do, unbegotten, self-sufficing, and within his limits omniscient. And, starting from this point, we should say that when Homer calls Lacedæmon 'hollow,' and Argos 'thirsty,' it no more proves that he had visited those places than when a modern bard writes of sea-girt Venice, or seven-hilled Rome. But when Homer compares the tribes of warriors pouring into the Scamandrian plain, to the 'many nations of winged birds' alighting with clangour in the Asian meadow, beside the streams of Cnyster, we have caught

our mutable Proteus in the fact. He was *there*; and at the distance of three thousand years, we can safely imagine him gazing at the natural scene which he has thus rendered immortal, on the banks of his own Ionian river.

Adopting this kind of discriminating analysis — which, we must say, is wholly contrary to Mr. Gladstone's more sweeping style of criticism — while we yield neither to him nor to any critic in our appreciation of the 'intense realism' of Homer, as the phrase is — of the wonderful precision, conciseness, and force, with which he renders into verse that which he has actually seen or heard, — we are forced, nevertheless, to limit the extent of his personal knowledge, as proved by internal evidence, to a far narrower circle. We receive as established no more than this: —

1. That the author of the *Iliad* was well acquainted with the region round Tröy, and with parts of the *Ægean* coast.

2. That the author of the *Odyssey* was personally familiar with the western side of Greece, and familiar, either from eyesight or the reports of eye-witnesses, with several of the scenes of the Ulyssean wanderings.

With the first of these propositions we will not here concern ourselves. With regard to the local knowledge possessed by the author of the *Odyssey*, we have a good deal more to say; and if any of our readers think that we have devoted too large a space to this province of antiquated fable, we have only to urge in excuse, first, that we shall be able thus to give a clearer view of Mr. Gladstone's peculiar way of dealing with the subject of his criticism than any mere general observations will afford; and, secondly, to plead the surpassing interest which still lingers in many minds around those magic scenes and memories.

Were the wanderings of Ulysses real, and, if so, what was their locality? It is scarcely necessary to say, that antiquity in general had no doubt on either point. From the dawn of authentic history in the writings of Thucydides — from the far earlier date, in all probability, of the *Theogony* ascribed to Hesiod, — no one questioned, for centuries, that the hero was conducted by the poet from point to point along the Italian and Sicilian shores. Eratosthenes passes for the first critic who started the theory that the wanderings are mere poetical figments: that we shall find out their localities only 'when we find the bag in which *Æolus* shut up the winds;' a theory of which Payne Knight, and Mr. Grote, are the modern English exponents; and it was in answer to Eratosthenes that Strabo laid down that canon of criticism which might serve as a motto to the first part of Mr. Gladstone's work: 'ἐκ μηδενὸς δὲ ἀλήθους ἀνάπτειν καὶνὴν τερατολογίαν, οὐχ Ὀμήρικον: 'to construct a

'new fabric of marvellous stories without any real foundation is '*un-Homeric*.'

Mr. Gladstone, adopting in this instance the traditional Peelite policy of the third course, but with really wonderful ingenuity, invents and supports a new alternative, which, we venture to say, will interest and amuse many readers, will astonish more, but will not obtain the assent of one. We say invents, because though Dureau de la Malle, Müller (Orchomenos), and possibly others, had indicated that certain passages in the Wanderings accorded rather with eastern than with western legends, and pointed out in particular the Bosphorus as the probable scene of some of the wonders described, none, so far as we know, before Mr. Gladstone, ever spun these notions into a complete theory. In his work, however, we have it at length, illustrated by a most remarkable map; and we are desired to believe that all antiquity was in error; that Homer was indeed as 'real' as Strabo could suppose him, but that the course of Ulysses lay through the Euxine and Palus Mæotis into a vast, imaginary, hyperborean waste of waters, communicating with the circumfluent river of Ocean—a chaotic sea, teeming with obscure terrors, like that which welters on the dreary surface of Dr. Whewell's planet Jupiter.

Now every Homeric scholar who believes that there is any semblance of fact in the Ulyssean wanderings at all, will doubtless agree in the truth of some of Mr. Gladstone's data. There can be no question that many of their marvels have an oriental cast. There can be no question that they are in some way connected with the legends (posterior in date so far as we have evidence) of the Argonautic expedition. How, then, are we, without surrendering the problem as hopeless, to reconcile the inconsistency between eastern legends and a western topography?

On this point the ancients in general saw no difficulty; they connected the stories by bringing back the ship *Argo* through the Italian seas, and constructing a mythical relationship between the wonders she encountered on her outward oriental voyage, and those which she met with in her return along that western course which became afterwards the track of Ulysses. Neither has Mr. Gladstone any doubt; but he arrives, as his way is, at precisely the converse of the ordinary conclusion. He holds (vol. iii. p. 300.)—

'That it is much more reasonable to construct Homer as shifting essentially the site of Scylla and Charybdis, than the site of the Bosphorus Again, I take the island Thrinacie by itself: and I contend that, although the report on which this delineation was

founded may probably have had its origin in Sicily, yet the Thrinacie of Homer is associated rather with the east than with the west.'

In short, to sum up in a very naked way notions which he has invested with an elaborate texture of reasoning woven out of most insignificant premisses, he believes that Homer placed the Euxine in connexion with the Ocean-stream by a vast tract of sea extending to the northward and north-westward of Thrace and Macedon; Scylla at the Dardanelles; the Cimmerians by the sea of Azof; and Ogygia somewhere about the latitude and longitude of St. Petersburg!

We must own that after studying attentively his reasons for these ingenious novelties, we do but remain more firmly attached to the ancient faith. We know that the Phœnician mariners, from whom most of Homer's information is derived, were familiar from early ages with the eastern seas; we know that in later, but still ante-Homeric times, they penetrated far into those of the West; we know that they transplanted their religion, their usages, and their superstitions westward; and we feel no difficulty in thus comprehending and accounting for the oriental associations which they threw round those regions of the sunset, with which later experience made them familiar; nor, in consequence, for those apparently inappropriate hues of morning in which Homeric poetry has invested myths locally belonging to the Italian seas. We hold this theory, which is substantially Strabo's, to be a far more feasible way of accounting for the inconsistencies in question, than to transfer western legends, against the established trade-wind of legendary lore, back again to the East. Nor is this, to us, a mere matter of antiquarian interest. Mr. Gladstone's interpretation makes Homer sin against the received canons of poetical truth, no less than of mythical history. That Homer, in common with all the unsophisticated children of men, placed that dreary abode of the dead which was visited by Ulysses far towards the sunset, is a position of which we cannot for a moment entertain a doubt. The Gladstonian theory that Hades lies in the East, 'as a counterpart to the Elysian Fields in the West;' the 'cosmogonical arrangement, which planted in the West the Elysian Plain, and 'in the East the dismal domain of Aïdoneus,' seem to us equally unpoetical and unfounded. The connexion of the daily departure of the sun with the end of life is rooted in the mind of man. We meet it everywhere, in forms of the strangest diversity, in the traditions of races utterly divided by space and history. The Red Indians' land of the Shades is ever beyond the setting sun. When the peasant of the German sea-coast, in ages gone by, questioned a 'Mâr' or ghost from the ghost-country, such as he

used to meet by twilight along the shore, whence it came, the answer was, 'from England' (the West.) But, among the Asiatic races from which the ancient Grecian mythology was derived, the notion had acquired all the fixity of religious truth.* The 'Amenti,' or kingdom of the Dead, of the Egyptians, is the same with 'Ement,' West; and all along the Nile valley, the western hills are those appropriated to the tombs. The Semitic languages have a similar root. 'Erebus,' 'ereb,' 'gharb,' are simply darkness = 'the West;' the same root appears in 'Europe,' 'Arabia,' (the western part of Asia relatively to the primitive dwellers on Euphrates), and in 'Algarve,' the south-western extremity of the Iberian peninsula. *ζῶφος*, the West, and 'Erebus,' seem also to be identical in the description of the rock Scylla. (Od. xii. 81.). The universal tradition is assumed without question, by the author of the *νεκῦια* in the last book of the *Odyssey*, who dismisses the ghosts of the slain suitors from Ithaca *παρὰ λεύκαδα πέτρην*, past the Leucadian rock, that is, despite of all Mr. Gladstone's refinements, over the western sea. That the site of Homer's Erebus was westerly seems therefore to us an undoubted truth, and the sure key of the general locality of the Wanderings, supposing them to have had any locality at all.†

This broad principle being admitted; are the minor and special western identifications of points in the Wanderings likely to be such mere empty devices of the 'pardonable ambition of 'after times' as Mr. Gladstone, from his paradoxical point of view — and Mr. Grote, from the sceptical or Eratosthenite point of view — equally assume? We think otherwise, and cannot give up our cherished prepossessions in favour of the older doctrine. We still hold that some of the points touched by Ulysses are capable of western identification, to a high degree of probability; and that if some of these floating legends can thus be fixed and realised, it is scarcely critical to deny that others were (to the poet) real also, although the means of identi-

* See Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. ii. p. 83.

† Mr. Gladstone is quite aware of the true poetical law of — 'that close association between the west and darkness, which the sunset of each day brought before the eyes of men: so that to lie *πρὸς ζῶπον* meant, to lie towards the west, and was the regular opposite of lying towards the sun' (vol. iii. p. 351.): and yet elsewhere, pressed by some supposed necessity of his argument, he tells us that 'we have occasion to notice, in various forms, the association in Homer's mind of ideas belonging to darkness with the east.' (vol. iii. p. 295.) This is the kind of license he continually assumes, 'to say, unsay, and be consistent still.'

fiction may be lost in the confusion of imperfect knowledge and supernatural imagery. But for this purpose it is necessary to apply our critical tests with extreme caution. Stripping off, for a moment, the conventionalisms which have gathered round the idea of Homer, and trying to get at him in his simple character of the Maker, or story-teller, let us try to distinguish, by probable rules, where the compiler of fiction, in a simple age, is drawing more or less on fact, and where he is drawing on imagination.

For instance, let your story-teller be describing an enchanted castle: all the minute particulars which are necessary to the purpose of the story will be inserted as a matter of course — the gate at which hangs the mysterious horn the hero is to sound; the dark vaulted passage through which he penetrates; the moat he swims; the staircase he scales; the chamber in which the sleeping warders sit entranced by magic; all these, being parts of the fabric of his story, will be minutely described, whether he is drawing on his imagination only, or whether he is weaving into the tale recollections of some place he has seen or heard of. But, if he introduce also a class of particulars, such as are neither essential to the conduct of the story, nor poetically appropriate to its adornment; such as seem rather to delay the action, and direct the attention to indifferent things: if at a particular point of the castle you find a double staircase, or a round window, or any other architectural feature, without any bearing on the context; if you are told that on turning to the left you see a particular view, or on turning to the right you reach a gateway leading to a particular place; especially if these unmeaning, yet note-worthy minutiae are introduced in that unexpected, in-artificial way which is easier to indicate than describe; then we may say, with perfect safety, that the story-teller in question has some real place in his mind, however it may suit him to disguise or embellish the reality.

Now, this test, which we are applying only to the Homeric geography, is precisely that which Mr. Gladstone has applied, with great judgment, as it seems to us, to the character of the Homeric writings in general.

‘Over and above the episodes,’ he says, ‘which seem to owe their place in the poem to the historic aim, there are a multitude of minor shadings which run through it, and which, as Homer could have derived no advantage from feigning them, we are compelled to suppose real. They are part of the graceful finish of a true story, but they have not the showy character of what has been invented for effect. Why, for instance, should Homer say of Clytemnestra, that till corrupted by Ægisthus she was good? Why should it be worth his

while to pretend that the iron ball offered by Achilles for a prize was the one formerly pitched by Eetion? Why should he tell us that Tydeus was of small stature? Why does Menelaus drive a mare? These questions, every one will admit, may be indefinitely multiplied.' (Vol. i. p. 28.)

Lastly, even gross mistakes, where such can be pointed out, occurring in apparently real descriptions, are by no means evidence conclusive against their reality. Such often occur in the strangest and most unexpected places, and are probably mere slips of memory. Thus Walter Scott, the most observant of men in local description, makes in the 'Antiquary' the sun set in the sea on the eastern coast of Scotland, as Mr. Gladstone points out for another purpose. And M. Alexandre Dumas, a very life-like writer too, in his romantic way, lying at anchor in the Straits of Messina, sees the sun rise *behind* that city. We can give no better parallel, or explanation, for Homer's strange and much criticised description of Ithaca as lying to the west — *πρὸς ὄφρον* — of the neighbouring islands; the fact being distinctly the reverse.

One caution, however, may be given, though hardly necessary to an intelligent reader. This accuracy and minuteness of insignificant detail are not unfrequently assumed by writers of fiction expressly to mislead, or amuse, their readers by the false appearance of truth. There is no more commonly practised art by those who intend

Ψεύδεια πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,

and who are confident in their own powers of execution. Take, for instance, the travels of Swift's 'Gulliver,' a well known *tour de force* in this way. We quote from the beginning of the voyage to Laputa a passage which serves our turn the better, as it reads like a burlesque on the *Odyssey*.

'On the fifth of November, which was the beginning of summer in those parts, the weather being very hazy, the seamen spied a rock within half a cable's length of the ship: but the wind was so strong, that we were driven directly upon it, and immediately split. Six of the crew, of whom I was one, having let down the boat into the sea, made a shift to get clear of the ship and the rock. We rowed by my computation about three leagues, till we were able to work no longer, being already spent with labour while we were in the ship. We therefore trusted ourselves to the mercy of the waves, and in about half an hour the boat was overset by a sudden flurry from the north. . . . When I was almost gone, and unable to struggle any longer, I found myself within my depth: and by this time the storm was much abated. The declivity was so small, that I walked near a mile before I got to the shore, which I conjectured was about eight o'clock in the evening,' — and so forth.

Here is a collection of insignificant circumstances, very naturally told, and with the mere purpose of mystifying the reader: which they doubtless did, in the case of the worthy Bishop who had read 'Gulliver,' but 'could not believe all of 'it.' We might have quoted still more effectually from De Foe, the greatest among all masters of this trick. But it *is* a trick—the trick of an advanced and critical age—and, we may safely assume, among the things which Strabo would have comprehended in his denunciation as 'un-Homeric.' 'The facility of 'assuming in literary composition an archaic costume, voice, and 'manner,' says Mr. Gladstone with great truth—may we not add, that of assuming any affected or artificial manner—'do 'not belong at all either to an age like that of Homer, or to an 'age of which the literary conditions at all resemble it.'

Let us then, as far as we can without wearying the patience of our readers, apply to some details of the voyage of Ulysses the discriminating test between particulars which *may* (not *must*) have been simply invented, because they are either, 1. not minutely characteristic; or 2. needed for the purpose of the story, and therefore likely to have been so invented: and those which (if we are right) *must* have been real and local, because they are at once minutely characteristic, and insignificant or incidental.

When Ulysses approaches the lofty city of the Læstrygonians, he finds an artificial harbour, with a quay of stone on either side, projecting moles, and a narrow entrance. The description is minute, but it gives no idea of local reality. It is a model of a commercial harbour in a tideless sea. It may have been derived from some sailor's story, or it may be simply imaginary and ornamental—the text, if we will but fairly judge it, gives no help towards solving the question.

When Circe describes to Ulysses the coast on which he is to land to consult the spirits of the dead, the particulars on which she dwells—the Ocean River, the tributary streams of Phlegethon and Coeytus, the grove of Proserpine, the rock overhanging the confluence of the rivers of Hades,—these may well be no more than 'such stuff as dreams are made of;' there is no token of waking life about them. But there is one single feature in the description which savours strongly of earthly topography; the adventurer is told to land *ἐνθ' ἀκτὴ τὴ λάχυστι* 'where he finds a 'short strip of beach.' Standing where it does, the passage strikes on the mind with the full effect of a 'sailing direction'—there was *probably* something in the poet's mind beyond the mere fabric of fancy; some *real* beach, consecrated in the mari-

ner's legend, on which the daring visitor pulled up his vessel when about to visit the regions of the dead.

When Ulysses is to pass between Scylla and Charybdis — incontestable realities* — the approach is indicated by Circe in language which again bears the special character of a sailing direction. On the one hand he will pass the rock of Scylla, of which the height, as well as the other terrors, are poetically amplified; 'but,' adds Circe, 'you will observe that the opposite rock is lower, and very close; it looks as if you might shoot an arrow across' (we boldly thus translate *καί*

* Scylla and Charybdis are really such self-evident localities, that nothing but the strange perversity of antiquaries, in looking everywhere but at the text, could have raised any doubt or obscurity about them. Many, for instance, including the unobservant class of English classical tourists, have been disappointed, and voted the poet a deceiver, because their guides show them a whirlpool close to the harbour of Messina, vulgarly called the *Galofaro*, and call this Charybdis. This pseudo-Charybdis, vouched for by Fazello, and a host of Sicilian antiquaries, is twelve miles from Scylla, and at least four from the Italian shore; so that those who stick both to text and tradition have been driven to the idle supposition of changes by 'convulsions of nature.' All this is mere delusion; the scytle-shaped spit of land which gave Messina its early name, still preserves its classical form; Reggio, on the other shore, stands on the beach where the Locrians raised it, at the dawn of history, and only a few generations after Homer; and any one who passes may see the true Charybdis, at proper times of tide and current, eddying just where Homer or his informant beheld it, immediately under the Faro lighthouse. Those who have not seen the spot will find it nowhere so thoroughly described as in the pages of pains-taking old Philip Cluverius, worth any number of ingenious moderns. Philip had been to the Straits on purpose to study them; had asked many questions, as he tells us, of English, Dutch, and other skippers; and he remains sorely perplexed between his extreme respect for the authority of Fazello and others, and his own clear judgment and eyesight. For he had himself known a 'trireme' whirled helplessly round in the true (not antiquarian) Charybdis. The error of the old tradition is manifest; and the manner in which it may probably have arisen is worth investigating, as it may furnish a clue in similar cases. The fact appears to be that, in Sicily (owing above all to the sweeping effects of the Saracen conquest) the condition was clean broken for ages. This is evident from the names of places; not a headland, river, or other natural feature of importance, retained its ancient name; *Ætna* itself passed into oblivion, and was succeeded by *Mongibello*; nothing was left except the names of the few large cities which doubtless preserved their old language and inhabitants. The case is quite the reverse on the Italian side, where a very large proportion of the classical names are retained.

κεν διοϊστεύσεας). Now these landmarks, the high rock of Scylla to the left, the lower promontory of the Faro to the right, and their seeming close proximity, are precisely the appearances which strike the traveller and guide the pilot nearing the entrance to the Straits of Messina; and such as they are at the present day, such we may be sure did Homer, or his Phœnician informant, behold them thirty centuries ago.

We ought to insert here — though it is Strabo's instance, not ours — the little circumstance of the monster Scylla's habitual employment in fishing for 'sea-dogs,' that is, the sword-fish or *Pesce Spada*, the chase of which is still pursued with peculiar success at the entrance of the Straits, as it was in the days of Strabo himself, and for the natural reasons which he assigns. Here, says Strabo, *δοκεῖ οἰκίον τι εἰρησθαι*, 'a local feature,' as we should phrase it.

When Ulysses sights the dusky mountains of Scheria, the land of the Phæacians, on the eighteenth day of his voyage from Calypso's isle, they appear to him *ὥς ὅτε ῥινὸν ἐν ἡροσιδεῖ πόντῳ*—

'Spread like a buckler on the dark blue sea.'

It has been observed that the outline of Corfu, seen from the north-west, answers very well to this simile. So, no doubt, does many another mountain outline. If the passage be cited as identifying Scheria with Corfu, it is worth little; but if cited as proving Homer's *realism*, it is worth a great deal. The man who composed it had unquestionably in view *some* real likeness, such as sailors are so fond of forming in their minds out of the profiles of the coasts they frequent, and bearing in memory as landmarks.

The hero is then cast on the coast of Scheria, and Professor Wilson (*Essays*, vol. iv. p. 368.) very finely points out to our notice the contrast between the various supernatural circumstances of the voyage, and 'the intense realism' of the escape:—

'The desperate and often baffled attempts of Ulysses to effect a landing are all so naturally, and vigorously, and minutely described, with absolutely no exaggeration at all, that we forget the supernatural aid that had hitherto borne him up; and now see in him merely an able-bodied seaman, sole survivor of a wreck, saving himself in the last extremity by great presence of mind, strength, and skill, in spite of surf and rock; and, soon as he crawls ashore, laying himself down—as does Ulysses—on some rushes growing by, and passionately and gratefully, and piously, "kissing the life-giving earth."'

One feels instinctively that the description, if original, can have been given by no man, save one who had himself been through the tumultuous agony of a rescue from drowning. So

it is ever in Homer; the unreal borders so closely on the real, and intertwines so subtly with it, as to constitute at once the great mystery, and almost the greatest charm of his art; and in this respect no mortal bard can be compared with him except Dante; who, as Mr. Gladstone has with great tact remarked, is at once singularly near him in essential character, and singularly far from him in subject and tone of thought; and had probably never read him at all. Then comes the landing place of Ulysses, the resort of Nausicaa—as a mere scene, enchantingly described—the full quiet ‘river’ stealing into the tideless sea, the rushy banks, the pebbly beach, the ‘brae’ by the river side—rare feature in a Grecian landscape—where the mules feed and the maidens play at ball. And it does so happen that one solitary spot exactly answering the description—just at the right distance for Nausicaa to drive and her maidens to walk from the supposed palace of Alcinous—just at the point where Ulysses would be naturally driven ashore, if he had rounded the North Cape of Corfu—does exist, in that lovely island; insomuch that the classical stranger who sees it is ready, like Ulysses, to kiss the earth at once, and surrender himself to the pleasing conviction of identity. But not so fast. The safer line of discrimination, which we have ventured to indicate, must be observed. The features—the ‘motives’ of the picture, as a German artist would call them—are minute indeed; but they are not undesigned, nor incidental. The scene was needed for the action of the drama; and, if Scheria were wholly imaginary, this charming description would equally have found a place, whether merely invented or adapted from casual recollection.

But when, a few lines lower down, Nausicaa directs Ulysses in the way to her father's palace, we feel at once instinctively,—by the application of the same Homeric tact of which we have spoken—that we touch bottom, and are within the domain of Realism. ‘There is a lofty wall round the city, and a ‘fine’ harbour on each side of it, and a narrow entrance’ (that is, we fully agree with Nitzsch, a narrow isthmus between the ports, not a narrow entrance by sea)’ ‘and ‘ships are drawn up on land on both sides of the way.’ Why this accumulation of particulars indifferent to the story—the double haven, and the narrow isthmus, and the very characteristic feature of the ships drawn up on each side of the road along it—unless the poet had here some real spot in his eye? Most unquestionably he had; and most unquestionably the site of the old city of Corcyra (not modern Corfu), answers the de-

scription exactly and almost alone.* Here, then, we take our stand with boldness,—and assume this as one of the clearest instances of identification which the *Odyssey* furnishes, and as a fair presumption that other scenes in it may be identified also.†

Again, from Scylla the vessel of Ulysses arrives in Thrinacie, which, as Mr. Gladstone correctly observes, appears to be close to Scylla, for it is reached *αὐτίκα*. The ship is windbound for a month in Thrinacie by Eurys and Notus (east and south winds; we have not forgotten Mr. Gladstone's very ingenious and elaborate table of the Homeric winds, by the help of which, certainly, a very wide scope may be given to geographical fancies; but it does not suit our more prosaic views: we believe, with Strabo again, that Homer's names of winds, taken from the practical language of sailors, are local; and in the *Faro*, Boreas and Notus are simply the north and south winds, —Maestro and Scirocco,—the only two that continuously blow there). 'When they finally set sail, we are not told with what wind it was; but after they have got out of sight of the island, the sky darkens, and mischief threatens,

αἶψα γὰρ ἦλθεν
κεκληγὼς Ζέφυρος, μεγάλην σὺν λαίλαπι θύων;

'and the ship goes to pieces in the tempest. At length Zephyr ceases, and Notus blows Ulysses back upon Scylla.' Thus far Mr. Gladstone: but he omits to notice one very special

* One harbour has become a marsh, otherwise the identification is exact.

† In the Ionian Islands, as elsewhere, the local traditions about the scenes of the poems, numerous as they are, seem to bear no note of being anything more than the echoes of later days, invented after the Homeric poetry had assumed its secondary or classical importance. Still, much of the discredit which attaches to them is not the fault of the traditions themselves, but of writers who have misinterpreted them; it is the learned, for instance, not the peasantry, who have turned in Corfu the 'Fountain of Crescidea' (whoever she may have been) into Nausicaa's 'river,' which it in no degree resembles. There can be little doubt, at all events, that the common people of these islands, never having been extirpated or dislodged by foreign conquest, have more of the real Greek blood and character than can be found on the mainland, overrun by many Slavonic and other irruptions. If any memories of classical Hellas yet linger on earth, it is here and in the *Ægean*. The peasantry of Corfu still preserve the Pyrrhic dance; their women still hear the 'Nerëides' (instead of the Fairies of Western Europe) wailing at nightfall in the shadowy glens which descend to the sea.

circumstance. When Notus arises, Ulysses becomes anxious lest it should drive him back on Charybdis ; —

φέρων ἐμοὶ ἄλγεα θυμῷ,
ὅφρ' ἔτι τὴν ὁλοὴν ἀναμετρήσαιμι Χάρυβδιγ.

Why this naturally expressed fear of a particular wind, if the story have no local reality? Why should Ulysses, had the voyage been imaginary, be afraid of the *south* wind carrying him back to the straits, when the poet had omitted before to tell us what wind brought him *from* them? Is not this one of those *crucial* passages which point out most distinctly that the narrative is not fictitious (as far as locality is concerned), but adapted and concocted from some actual sailor's story? And, with all these facts before us, can we have much doubt that the uniform old-world notion, which Mr. Gladstone slights, is the substantial one, and that 'Thrinacie,' thus defined by the cardinal points, was and could be nothing but the eastern coast of Sicily? Omitting, from want of space, Mr. Gladstone's argument from the legend of the *πλαγίται*, and also that from the supposed site of Picria, both of which might, without much difficulty, be proved inconclusive; and having, by leave of our readers, fixed Scheria and Thrinacie as two realities, let us see what is to be made of that which comes between them in the narrative, the mysterious Ogygia, the secret isle of Calypso. Mr. Gladstone, consistently with his theory, places it in the far north-east, somewhere about St. Petersburg, as his map indicates. His reasons for doing so are, the general one, that it suits his theory, and certain special ones, with which we shall be brought in contact while endeavouring to point out our own reasons for holding the ancient faith.

Mr. Gladstone (here concurring with many other authorities) imagines that Ulysses, after his shipwreck on Charybdis, was carried northward through the Straits, and that the general direction of Ogygia is to be sought in that quarter. It might, perhaps, easily be shown, that the contrary is the natural conclusion from the poet's words: that the shipwrecked mariner, out of whose tale the lay of Ulysses was framed, drifted back from Charybdis to the southwards; and that in fair probability, the Ogygia of the twelfth book lay far in the southern Mediterranean, in which respect it perfectly agrees with the Ogygia of the fifth book. For the poet there tells us, that Ulysses on his raft, sailing from Ogygia toward Scheria (Corfu, as we have seen), watched all night the constellations of heaven, and especially the Bear —

τὴν γὰρ δὴ μιν ἄνωγε Καλυψώ, διὰ θεῶων,
ποντοπορεύμεναι ἐπ' ἀριστερά χειρὸς ἔχοντα.

That is, plainly enough, he was to hold an easterly, or rather north-easterly, course. It might be thought that this most direct and positive passage would have frightened any critic, but more especially one who professes as his maxim a conscientious adherence to the text, out of maintaining the paradox that Ogygia lay in the extreme north. But not so with Mr. Gladstone. His spirit rises with his difficulties, and he sets himself bravely to work to pull down the authority of the passage,—one of the few substantial indications in topography which Homer has been pleased to leave us. Nothing can be more characteristic than the resolute and sanguine way in which he sets about this difficult operation (vol. iii. p. 315.), arguing,—

1. That the passage is spurious. Here Mr. Gladstone yields to temptation, and adopts the ‘dangerous and seductive practice’ which he condemns in others. But the only substantial reason which he gives seems to us rather in favour of its genuineness. He says that it is the only passage in which the art of sailing by the stars is alluded to. True: the Homeric Greeks did not sail by the stars; but the Phœnicians certainly did: and Calypso, according to Mr. Gladstone himself, was a Phœnician nymph, learned in all the recondite lore of her people. One of the numerous legends about Thales, who was himself of Phœnician descent, recounts that he indicated to the Greeks the position of the stars in the Lesser Bear, ‘by which constellation the Phœnicians used to steer.’

2. That the phrase, ἐν ἀριστερὰ χεῖρὸς, occurs nowhere else in Homer.

3. But if it must be admitted into the text, then, by a wonderful feat of prestidigitation, Calypso’s direction is made to mean precisely the converse of what it has always hitherto been supposed to mean, and right stands for left. To this most elaborate piece of special pleading Mr. Gladstone has devoted a long, separate excursus, which is worth reading, to show with how much ingenuity a complex solution of a problem may be supported when one is determined not to adopt the simple one. But the truth is, that though the phrase, ἐν ἀριστερὰ χεῖρὸς, does not occur elsewhere in Homer, it does occur, and in precisely the same nautical sense, in Apollonius Rhodius, the imitator, and as it were the scholiast, of the *Odyssey*; who tells us that the Argonauts, in sailing up the river Phasis, had Caucasus, ἐν ἀριστερὰ χεῖρῶν: that is, most unquestionably, on their left; which parallel passage, we humbly submit, disposes of the question, and of nearly thirty pages of Mr. Gladstone.

Placing Ogygia, then, far south and west in the Mediterranean, what is the improbability of the supposition, that Malta

was the spot really in the mind of the poet, however obscure and vague his information respecting that distant islet may have been? Here, it must be admitted, we have no ancient legend to rely on; the first who hazarded this conjecture, if we are rightly informed, was Callimachus of Alexandria. But we willingly call in Mr. Gladstone — who rejects the supposition with contempt — as a witness, nevertheless, to one or two pregnant proofs in its favour. ‘The name of Calypso,’ he says, ‘places Ogygia wholly beyond the circle of Greek maritime experience; as does her relation to Atlas, who holds the pillars, that is, stands at the extremity, of earth and sea.’ The derivation of the name of this cruel Queen of Faëry (from *καλύπτειν*) points, we fully agree with Mr. Gladstone, to the mystery in which the Phœnician navigators enveloped their discoveries: — ‘the likelihood that, they would cast a veil over the regions of which they knew the profitable secrets. In conformity with these ideas, the island of Ogygia is the island of Calypso, the concealer; and this Calypso is the daughter of Atlas.’ As Mr. Gladstone also remarks, Atlas is *ὁλοόφρων*, an epithet bestowed in the Poems on Phœnicians only, implying wisdom and cunning. But the much-knowing King Atlas was connected in the Greek mind with the continent of Africa from the earliest times. Now let us remember that Malta, adjacent to that continent, was, according to the report of Diodorus Siculus, a Phœnician colony in ages long anterior to her second occupation by Carthaginians (a report corroborated by the monuments of untold antiquity now daily disinterred from her freestone caverns, those especially which appertain to the service of the god Melkarth, and other Eastern divinities); and the conclusion is strongly borne in upon us, that either Ogygia is mere dream-land, or the old Alexandrian guessed right, and Malta, obscurely heard of, lying far in those southern waves into which no Greek had the hardihood to penetrate, was the substance of the Poet’s ideal.

Here, then, we rest satisfied, persuaded that the cardinal doctrine of antiquity on this subject is true, by its exact application to a certain number of known sites. It is quite unnecessary to attempt farther identification, or to imitate the laborious ‘realism’ of the Italian antiquaries of a past generation, as fashionable in its day as the laborious scepticism of modern Germans. We may leave the Læstrygons, with their

‘Polar day, which shall not know

A sunset ’till its summer ’s done —’

and the brazen-walled isle of Æolus, and the Cimmerians, those mysterious dwellers on the confines between the living and the

dead, and Cocytus and Phlegethon, the sounding cataracts of fire which mingle with the ocean-river, as unknown quantities in our calculation; though with the belief that it is more likely, from analogy, that they arose out of some hazy tradition of Arctic coasts and volcanic regions, than out of mere nothing. But, in the main, we may safely hold that the Ulysses of Homer's mind did perform his real or fabulous pilgrimage along those very Italian shores which, during ages since elapsed, have loomed in the eyes of travellers, to whom the poet has been the object of early and studious love, like the outlines of familiar scenery welcoming the truant home.

We have occupied already much of our space and our readers' time, and this without touching on those subjects which will possess by far the greatest interest for the mass of readers,—the part assigned to Homer by Mr. Gladstone in the development of moral and religious truth, we may almost say, in the providential history of man. We can but say with sincerity, it is from no want of appreciating Mr. Gladstone's loftiness of perception, no want of sympathy with his enthusiasm, that we have avoided this portion of his great undertaking. It has been from a reverential shrinking from the attempt to compress what must needs be said on so great and solemn a topic—if aught is to be said at all—into the limits of an ordinary critical essay. But in the outlines of our author's view of this chapter of Homeric study, we, for our own parts, unfeignedly concur, and in his summary of the great volume of natural religion contained in the Poems. And yet, with all his admiration of the Homeric records, he has drawn from them the true lesson, that they do but, after all, 'show
' us the total inability of our race, even when at its maximum
' of power, to solve for ourselves the problems of our destiny;
' to extract for ourselves the sting from care, from sorrow,
' and, above all, from death; or even to retain without waste
' the knowledge of God, where we have become separate from
' the source which imparts it.'

That this source was primeval tradition, distinct alike from the development of human intelligence and from the knowledge reflected from Scripture, is Mr. Gladstone's full conviction. He applies, with large and bold judgment, to the heroic race of which Homer has preserved the remains, the philosophical poet's revelation concerning the individual spirit of man:—

'The soul that rises in us, our life's star,
Has had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar:
Heaven lies about us in our infancy!'

But he appears to forget that the theory thus eloquently adum-

brated may be traced in the speculations of many great thinkers, particularly of the seventeenth century; forming, for instance, the basis of the majestic argument of Cudworth, and entering into the substance of Isaac Vossius's work of exuberant learning, 'De Theologiâ Gentili.'

But be this as it may, it is not the less interesting to find these views enforced, with an energy, and at the same time a refinement of perception, which brings them home to us with all the force of originality. So much the more are we forced to lament the singular idiosyncrasy which mars the grandest conceptions, by working them out into trivial, nay grotesque, details. Such is Mr. Gladstone's nature, and we can but deal with it as we find it. Remonstrance would be useless. Because we think we perceive the relics of some ancient learning derived from on High, amidst the endless figments of human creation with which it is overlaid in Homer, are we therefore to be called on to subscribe to such articles of faith as that Jupiter, Apollo, and Minerva—or Jupiter, Pluto, and Neptune—represent the Trinity? or that Latona is 'the woman from whom the seed was to spring, if indeed she does not represent the Blessed Virgin . . . or rather our ancient mother Eve; . . . or asked whether it is not 'more just to regard her as a typical person, exhibiting through womanhood the truth of our Blessed Lord's humanity, than as the mere representative of any individual personage'! It is with much reluctance—arising from the solemn nature of the subjects thus unintentionally profaned, even more than out of our respect for the high aims and principles of the writer—that we call attention to these unreal speculations. But the mere scoffers have called attention to them long ago. And though there may be many who will rather regret than scoff, and some, doubtless, who may admire, we may venture to assert that of Mr. Gladstone's numerous readers, not one will be persuaded by them.

The same fine qualities, and the same fanciful tendencies, display themselves in Mr. Gladstone's summary of the ethical, as of the religious, aspect of the Homeric age. We doubt whether any one has ever appreciated its real nobleness so fully, or described it so eloquently. He has portrayed it, as in truth it was, so far as its memorials enable us to judge—an age of youth, and freshness, and undoubting faith—such as, in combination with such intellectual greatness, the world has never seen again.

'All was forward movement. Man had not, as it were, time to ask himself, is this a lie? or even, whither does it tend? His soul, in those days of infancy, never questioned, always believed. Logical inconsistency, even moral solecism, did not repel it, or darken its

energies in the work of construction, — construction of art, construction of manners, construction of polity, construction of religion. This is what we see in glowing heat, throughout the poems of Homer, and is perhaps the master key to their highest interest. They show us, in the province we are now considering, heroes earning their title to the Olympian life, mute nature everywhere adjusting itself to the scheme of supernatural impersonations, and religion allied to the human imagination, as closely as it was afterwards by Mahomet wedded to the sword. Everywhere we see that which is properly called "myth," *in the process of formation*. Early mythology is the simple result of the working of the human mind, in a spirit of belief or of credulity, upon the material offered to it by prior tradition, by the physical universe, by the operations of the mind, and by the experience of life.' (Vol. ii. p. 17.)

Mr. Gladstone is in the right. As Goethe points out, that in the plains we get the weather ready made, in the mountains we see it making, so when we approach the primitive *officina* of our race, as we approach it in Homer and in some parts of the Scriptures alone, we seem to see human character in the process of formation, unfolding its powers, and preparing itself for the vast flights which it is hereafter to perform. And yet, though society is in its infancy, the nature of each individual man is complete; it has nothing childish or imperfect: though confined as to external development within the limits imposed by ignorance and want of artificial helps, it has attained internally as full a type of manliness and ripeness as is allotted to the short-lived race of mortals. The Homeric poems — and still more, perhaps, such commentaries as Mr. Gladstone's, in which the knowledge acquired by much study and extensive familiarity with life is brought to bear on them, — afford lessons of value in no respect more than in this — the exalted idea which they tend to form of the ethical acquirements of man in what is termed a rude state. We need this lesson deeply. In ages of comparative weakness and discouragement, men look backwards, and fondly recall the characteristic features of generations which they esteem better, or at least happier, than their own. In periods of hope and full-blown prosperity, like that in which we live, they look habitually forwards, and exult in the doctrine of constant progress, in moral as well as physical well-being. Only such an age as ours could have nurtured the paradox, which an able writer has just raised into something like a fashionable doctrine, that the advance of man, generation by generation, is to be measured solely by his progress in intellectual acquirement. The volumes before us may serve as a refutation of this elaborate fallacy, and the more complete because unintended. They exhibit the elevation which the ethical character of man had attained — what-

ever the cause — in an age and country when in knowledge he was the merest child. They show how noble he was in thought, how honourable in dealing, how courteous in demeanour, how manly in the control of passion, how pure in the domestic relations of life, in times when he could neither read nor write, nor steer a ship, nor survey a field. They lead us, by a farther process of mind, to the inevitable conclusion, that unless the advance of the intellect be salted with salt of another description, it is surely accompanied with moral decline; that 'the movement of Greek morality with the lapse of time was chiefly downward, not upward;' that from the age of Homer, the real descent is rapid to that of Euripides, and thence to that of Lucian, let the pride of knowledge rebel against the doctrine as it may.

But here, again, it is lamentable to see how breadth and force of moral perception are overlaid, in Mr. Gladstone's mind, by the same scholastic tendency to absurd minuteness which characterises his religious speculations. This quality is even grotesquely developed in those disquisitions on the Homeric notions of love, gallantry, and matrimony, as our grandmothers would have phrased it, with which he has filled so large a part of these volumes, evidently to his own great satisfaction, as well as to the enhancement of his popularity with a large class of his readers. He has indeed well pointed out — though not better than others before him* — the singular purity and dignity of language, on all matters connected with this subject, which prevail in the Homeric, and we may add, the Tragic poetry of Greece — differing, in this respect, from the poetry of almost all other nations. Nor do we substantially quarrel with his belief, that this purity extended beyond language only, and that the domestic condition of the age described by Homer was free from taint to a perhaps unexampled degree. It may be added with truth, that the general subject of the relation between the sexes has, in Homer, only its due proportion to the other subjects which engage a free and healthy disposition. For the tendency of literature to dwell too constantly on this topic, is a certain proof of the degeneracy of an age — more certain, perhaps, than increased grossness in the manner of doing so. But how ludicrously does Mr. Gladstone enfeeble his own arguments on

* Especially in Mr. H. Coleridge's 'Introduction to the Study of the 'Classical Authors:' a little work of peculiar interest, because, in truth, it contains the contributions of two minds — the one, that of an elegant classical scholar — the other, one of the strongest, as well as most refined, of female intellects.

this and kindred subjects, by the strange minutiae of controversy, description, and philology, into which he descends in the zeal of his advocacy! Which of his readers has not smiled over his curious attachment to the memory of Helen, and his conscientious endeavours to rescue the character of that primitive *Traviata* from aspersion — endeavours only second in industry to those which Victor Cousin so perseveringly makes in behalf of the forgotten demi-reps of the seventeenth century? or his disquisitions on what he calls the ‘case of Briseis?’ or his far-fetched apologies for the practical Mormonism of Achilles and Agamemnon? or his grammatical inquiries into the force of the active and middle voices, in order to ascertain whether Homer’s heroines really attended his heroes in the bath, or only caused them to be bathed by other people? But does not the smile become broader still, when we find the old Pagan poet pressed into the service of the Parliamentary corps with which Mr. Gladstone has been acting during recent sessions? when a negative authority is squeezed out of him against the ‘poor invention of divorce?’ or, stranger yet, when the copiousness of his vocabulary, in distinguishing different degrees of relationship by affinity, is shown to indicate that if he had lived he would have voted in decided opposition to Lord Bury on the question of marriage with a wife’s sister? Enough, however, and more than enough, of faults which, if not redeemed, are at least thrown greatly into the shade, by the noble display of qualities of a higher order.

Unquestionably the author of these remarkable volumes has much of the character described by Payne Knight, in better sense than Latin, ‘quanto quis ingenii viribus et doctrinæ copiiis præpolleat, tanto avidius præsumptas opiniones amplectitur, et tanto majore apparatu et validiore custodiâ contra communem hominum sensum eas tuetur.’ But his great redeeming quality — that which, so far from being inconsistent with these defects, would probably be yet more inconsistent with a deeper, but colder, insight into critical principles — is the intensity of Homeric feeling, the delicacy of Homeric tact, of which these volumes afford such ample evidence.

ART. VIII.—*Guy Livingstone, or Thorough.* Second Edition. London: 1858.

GUY LIVINGSTONE is rather a favourable specimen of a class of books which are one of the most characteristic literary products of the present day. It is not a work of art, nor is it a novel with a moral, nor is it a satire, nor a sporting story, though it belongs in some degree to each of these subdivisions of the prolific genus of fiction. An anonymous writer thinks it well to invent a character whose works and ways, and general view of life, he puts before the world, with a sort of tacit request to be informed what the world thinks of such a personage. It is a little difficult to say what is the exact meaning and value of such a proceeding. To some extent, no doubt, the author must be taken to endorse his hero's views, for the mere fact of excogitating and publishing them to the world, gives them a currency which they would not otherwise enjoy; but we are left in the dark as to the real extent of this resemblance, and, as in photographic portraits, there is a scowl on the features which is essentially untrue. The author has always a perfect right to turn round on his reader with the assertion, that he had no intention of recommending his hero either for imitation, or even for sympathy. He may say, as Lord Byron constantly did say,—My 'Corsairs' and 'Giaours' do not embody my own views. I am a poet and a peer, amusing myself with literature, and caring nothing for the moral fitness of things. But in truth such pleas are merely evasive. All fictions, unless they are composed in an artistic spirit as rare as it is in many respects excellent, have a direct moral, and do, in fact, produce moral results on those who read them. To read an elaborate account of a person's life and conversation, specifying his feelings and motives, is very like associating with him for a certain time; and it is hard to imagine any theory of authorship on which less responsibility attaches to the author of such a work, than that which belongs to a man who, being better acquainted than any one else with the character and conduct of another, introduces him to all his friends, and takes great trouble to make them intimate with him. If the person so introduced is a gambler, a blackleg, and a bully, the introducer would be condemned for his conduct, even though he might himself be the most irreproachable of mankind. It is, perhaps, the fairest and the most convenient method of dealing with such cases, to leave the author entirely out of consideration, to accept, for the time

being, the events and persons described as real, to discuss their character upon that supposition, and to leave the author to draw his own conclusions as to the degree in which he himself has been made the subject of praise or blame.

The story of Guy Livingstone is short. He is a young man of considerable wealth and enormous personal strength, which is accompanied with that grimness and ferocity of disposition which has of late years excited so much effeminate admiration. The early part of the book is occupied in stripping him for the ring and showing his postures. We are introduced to his 'enormous frame, square and steadfast as the keep of a castle,' though 'lean in the flanks as a wolf-hound' — a comparison, by the way, which in these days it is not very easy to appreciate. Moreover, he had 'a set sternness about the lips and lower jaw,' and altogether 'the face of one of those stone crusaders who look 'up at us from their couches in the Round Church of the 'Temple.' We never read of this sort of hero without a wish that we could put a whole batch of them into some convenient arena and leave them to fight it out. Would Brian de Bois Guilbert be a match for Lara? If Dandie Dinmont met Dirk Hatteraick, which would have the best of it? Would Rodolphe, the prince in disguise in the 'Mystères de Paris,' with his 'muscles of steel under a skin of velvet,' have got the better of Livingstone's 'sinewy arms,' and which of them all could cope with the mighty Comte de Monte Christo? Livingstone, to be sure, crumpled up a silver cup in his hand, which was 'all fibre and sinew like an oak-bough;' but then Dantès, after being, we forget how many years, in a loathsome dungeon, bent a chisel into the shape of a horse-shoe and straightened it out again — a feat, by the way, which speaks ill for the steel, whatever it proves as to the muscle.

After justifying his 'pitiless sternness' and other heroic properties, by thrashing a prize-fighter and performing some similar exploits, Livingstone entertains a circle of guests at his ancestral hall — Kerton Manor in Northamptonshire, a sort of temple of grimness. There had dwelt Colonel Livingstone, the hero's father, who, being mortally wounded, smote his assailant to such purpose that his helmet was cut in twain down to the cheek strap; there, too, had lived several other persons, all of whose portraits were remarkable for 'the same expression 'of sternness and decision about the lips and lower part of the 'face:' to wit, Beau Livingstone of the Court of Queen Anne, Prior Bernard, the friend of the great Earl of Warwick, and Sir Malise, surnamed 'Poing-de-fer,' who helped to storm Ascalon. It is rather unlucky that in ancient times people

were far less romantic than they are now. "If Sir Malise really was called 'Poing-de-fer,' it is probable that he owed his name not to a particularly strong arm, but to having lost his hand and supplied its place with an iron hook.* The circle of friends collected at this stern abode comprised Mr. Forrester, a dandy life-guardsmen, Miss Raymond, with whom he is in love, Miss Flora Bellasys, a voluptuous beauty, and Mr. Hammond, a gentleman in delicate health, who tells the story and is Livingstone's intimate friend. To them enters a certain unromantic Mr. John Bruce, a Scotchman, who is engaged to Miss Raymond, and who, though he has a good deal of strength, has no activity and does not care for field sports. The other members of the party hospitably try to make him as uncomfortable as they can, and after a time Mr. Forrester and Miss Raymond elope together, being furnished with money for that purpose by Livingstone.

Before this event takes place Mr. Hammond goes to Ireland, where he falls in with a second edition of Livingstone, one Ralph Mohun, who is even more ferocious than his friend, and very nearly as strong, though his strength is principally illustrated by the fact that when attacked in his house in Tipperary, 'his bushy beard bristled with rage;' and when he had occasion to knock a man down in Paris, 'the grey hair bristled round his savage face like a wild boar's at bay.' In early life Mohun had run away with a married woman, who died of a broken heart, with that lovely and pious composure which such persons usually show in novels. Inheriting an estate in Ireland, he becomes the terror and horror of the place, butchering a considerable number of rapparees, who make an attack upon his house, with a brutal ferocity which his biographer seems to take singular pleasure in describing. At the house of this savage brute Mr. Hammond hears of Forrester's elopement with Miss Raymond, and of Guy Livingstone's engagement to one Constance Brandon, a young lady of exquisite beauty, and of very high church principles and ascetic habits. Guy, as might have been expected, is rather strong meat for Constance, especially as he has a weakness for flirting with her lovely and extremely voluptuous rival, Flora Bellasys. One unlucky evening a ball takes place, at which Guy, Constance, and Flora are all present. Guy 'had been dining at the mess of his old regiment. 'I guessed from the unusual brilliancy of his eyes, and from 'the slight additional flush on his brown cheeks, that the wassail

* Ordericus Vitalis tells a story of a monk surnamed 'De manu ferrea;' which title he gained from the circumstance, that having had his hand cut off for an atrocious crime, he wore a hook instead of it.

‘had been deep.’ As policemen say, he was not drunk, but had been drinking. In this state of things he waltzes with Flora, and takes her into the conservatory to cool herself. ‘The fiery Livingstone blood, heated sevenfold by wine and passion, was surging through his veins like molten iron.’ He takes a tempting opportunity of kissing his partner, who enjoys being kissed, and has the additional satisfaction of being seen in that situation by Miss Constance Braadon, at which that young lady is so much disgusted that she casts off her lover on the spot, and, ‘the light dies in her eyes, and the colour in her cheeks, never to return to either again till she shall wake on the Resurrection morning.’ Hammond finds Guy next day in a very dogged frame of mind, about to start for the Continent, where, in the company of Ralph Mohun, he passes the winter in constant debauchery and gambling. Constance pines away, and ultimately dies of consumption. On her death-bed she writes to Guy twice to recall him: Flora intercepts the first letter, the second brings him to her bedside in time to see her once more. An affecting scene takes place, the gist of which is, that she tells him she thinks he will die before long, and gets him to promise not to marry Flora. He goes home in a brain fever; whilst he is convalescent Flora comes to see him, whereupon he swears a great oath that he will never forgive her, nor see her again, if he can help it. ‘I thought,’ says Mr. Hammond ‘and think still, that he erred on the side of harshness.’ We are inclined to think so too; why need he kick her down stairs? After his recovery, Guy goes abroad to Italy, but he is an altered man. A lazzarone is impudent: ‘but the old hardness of heart was wearing away.’ ‘Livingstone only lifted him by the throat and held him suspended against the wall, as you may see the children in those parts pin the lizards in a forked stick. Then he let him drop unhurt, but green with terror.’ Shortly afterwards he actually condescended to save the lives of some boatmen in the Bay of Naples, whom he took on board his yacht to avoid a white squall. ‘You will say that this was only an act of common humanity,’ observes his biographer. ‘If you had known the man you would have thought, as I did, that the words of her who was an angel then, were bearing fruit already’—crab apples at best. In Italy are the Forresters, and one evening Mr. Forrester is barbarously murdered by Bruce, his rival; Guy tracks him down, and he goes mad with remorse and terror, after making a full confession. Guy thereon returns to England in company with the widow, and the whole melancholy party return to Kerton, where one morning the hero riding his enormous horse Axeine—a brute edition of himself—

gets a fall. Axeine rolls on him, and crushes his spine, and after some weeks of horrible torture, grimly endured, he dies, and Miss Brandon's prophecy is accomplished.

Such is the story. Its general tone, as our readers will have observed, is a sort of glorification of strength and ferocity. Mr. Hammond reverences Guy, and more than half excuses Mohun, in consideration of their gifts in these particulars. We shall have a few words to say upon the doctrine immediately; but we are bound in fairness to observe, in the meantime, that the execution of the story is very good indeed. It is long since we have seen a better written novel. It is short, terse, and nervous; the composition is remarkably careful and scholar-like; and it is enlivened by vigorous epigrammatic wit. The character of Flora Bellays is excellently sustained, and some of the scenes are drawn with great power. We may refer, in particular, to a quarrel between Colonel Mohun and one Horace Levinge, a Jew debauchee, which leads to a duel, in which Levinge is killed, and to the confession made by Bruce of Forrester's murder. We have seldom read anything more horrible, yet it is neither disgusting nor unmanly. The author has a great taste for classical quotations; and the influence of the kind of education which they imply is sufficiently well marked throughout the whole book; but he has learnt from Mr. Thackeray the unpleasant trick of looking at classical characters from an essentially modern point of view. It is not unamusing to criticise pious Æneas according to the canons of that contempt for respectability which so largely influences all modern novelists; but that is not the way to understand Virgil.

The moral aspect of Guy Livingstone is of more interest than its literary merits. It does not, it is true, represent any particular school of thought or feeling; but it is one of the straws which show characteristically enough the set of that great body of undefined sentiment, which forms so important an element in the incoherent mass collectively known as public opinion. As we have already observed, a novel may be considered as a sort of indirect request by the author to the readers for sympathy, generally for admiration; and the questions suggested by the work before us are such as these: Was not Guy Livingstone a fine fellow? Was he not a very impressive and wonderful person, showing, whatever might be his faults, the inherent raciness and vigour of the stock from which he sprung? Is he not, at any rate, a very model of strength and sternness both of mind and body? Is it not a magnificent thing to be so stern and so strong? Such is the prevailing spirit of the book;

and as it is one which is somewhat popular in the present day in more quarters than one, it may be desirable to examine it. Guy Livingstone does not affect us with that kind of mixture of pity and terror which it seems to have been intended to produce. In the first place, we are something more than sceptical about the hero's strength, either of body or of mind; and, in the second, we dislike the system of what may be described as manifesto novels.

It may seem rather paradoxical to argue against the physical strength of a man who can hold people up by the neck like lizards in a forked stick, crumple up silver cups in his hand, thrash prize-fighters, and ride untameable horses, but it is so easy to pile Pelion upon Ossa in this way, in a novel, that we have a right to be critical. Nothing is more easy than to put together all sorts of astonishing feats, and to justify them by direct assertions, that in point of fact the person described was capable of performing them; but this is a very clumsy and unsatisfactory way of proceeding. The true method would, no doubt, be to describe the whole character in such a manner that the physical force of the body might be inferred from the habits of the mind. It is easy to say that a man has a 'huge frame' and 'iron muscles,' and to assign to him all the other conventional proofs of strength which novelists are so much in the habit of lavishing on their heroes, but it is a much more difficult and delicate matter to describe the influence which a constitution of that kind would produce upon habits of thought and feeling. To do this we require a much more intimate acquaintance with physiology, and a much greater exactness of thought, than most novel-writers possess. Physical strength, so far from being a very simple thing, is one of which it is by no means easy to form a clear conception. Guy Livingstone, with his enormous stature, immense weight, and power of drinking very hard without suffering any immediate inconvenience, may, in one sense, and for some purposes, have been a very strong man. Looking at him with the gloss off, as he would be at a somewhat later period of life, we can only think of him as an overgrown, unwholesome, irritable, obstinate, country squire, with about the most infernal temper that ever a man was cursed with. If this be so, it shows that the book does not set the whole man before us, but only a glorified vision of one short passage in his life.

It is curious to observe, in connexion with this matter, how very seldom a novelist endows his hero with really durable, or really serviceable, physical endowments. Even to a labouring man great muscular power is a matter of very secondary importance. There is a certain average amount of it which usually

accompanies sound health, good food, and the habit of exertion, which it is, no doubt, a misfortune not to possess; but all that a man in that station of life gets by being particularly large and muscular is a qualification for becoming a puddler in a foundry, a blacksmith, a coalheaver, a drayman, or a private in the Guards. The really valuable bodily gifts are gifts which no power on earth can render romantic. They have been tersely described as a large brain and a large heart. To speak in less emphatic language, they consist of a vigorous circulation of the blood, a well-braced nervous system, healthy lungs, and, above all, a good digestion. All this is perfectly consistent with an insignificant figure and a very moderate amount of muscular power.

It is, in fact, perfectly clear that when novelists put on the stage a giant like Guy Livingstone they do not mean to describe physical strength as it is, but merely perpetrate a piece of symbolism, in which the body represents the mental qualities which they propose to celebrate. Livingstone is rigged out with all the machinery of bone, muscle, swarthy complexion, superhuman constitution, and the rest, in order that the outer man may harmonise with the stern ferocity and terrible strength of the inner self; but when we look into the matter, the character is strong only in passion and obstinacy, not in respect of determination, which is the only true form of mental strength. The greatest test of strength of character is the deliberate formation of plans, and their resolute execution. If a man determines to be a politician, an author, a lawyer, a painter, a chess-player, or even a fox-hunter, like the late Mr. Assheton Smith, and carries out his purpose deliberately and vigorously, he shows strength of character. Livingstone does nothing of this sort. His nearest approach to a fixed scheme of life is his plan of marrying Constance Brandon, and of not marrying Flora Bellasys. In every step of this affair he shows weakness of mind proportioned to his strength of mere blind passion. It was a very weak-minded thing to kiss Flora, when he wanted to marry Constance, at all events when Constance was in the room. It was a still weaker thing to refuse, from mere pride, to make matters up, when Constance gave him a chance of doing so; and it was weakest of all to take to drinking and gambling because Constance would not have him. He was stubborn and violent enough, no doubt, but stubbornness and violence are only sham strength; according to Mr. Carlyle's noble phrase, 'a man in a convulsive fit is not strong though six men cannot hold him.' Livingstone's strength is merely convulsive. He is hardly ever a really voluntary agent, — a person that is, who acts from a real

deliberate judgment towards an end clearly apprehended and distinctly desired.

Apart from the radical defects of the character of the hero of the story, Guy Livingstone contains one remarkable feature, which fits in very appropriately with the worship of strength and audacity pervading the greater part of the book. A strange undertone of melancholy runs through it. The author is always making little semi-pious reflections about his hero, which are evidently sincere, but which have a somewhat ludicrous air when they are compared with the drift of the story. It is tinged, like so many other productions in the present day, by a sort of gentle and half-repentant scepticism. The writer has a remarkable familiarity with the ways of Providence, though such of his characters as he draws with any real vigour and sympathy are as far from being pious people, either in theory or practice, as can possibly be. They are all prodigal sons, wasting their substance in all sorts of riotous living, whilst he is always ready with the consolations of religion to make matters pleasant in a gentle, pathetic way. For example, Caroline Mannering (a married woman) runs away with Ralph Mohun, and lives with him miserably till her death; upon which the author converses with a supposititious Cornelia as follows:—

“She was rightly served!” says Cornelia; “such women ought to be miserable.” O rigid mother of the Gracchi! how we all respect you *trônante* in the comfortable cathedra of virtue inexpugnable, perhaps unassailed. Your dictum must stand for the present. The Court is with you. But I believe other balances will weigh the strength of temptation, the weakness of human endurance, the sincerity of repentance, and the extent of suffered retribution, when the Father of all that have lived and erred since the world began shall make up his jewels. In that day, I think the light of many orthodox virgins and dignified matrons will pale before the softer lustre of Magdalene the Saint.’

On another occasion, Guy gives his pocket-book to a poor girl in the street:—

‘How much did the case contain? Guy himself could hardly have told you: but, be sure, the Recorder of his many misdeeds knew, and reckoned it to the uttermost farthing, when he wrote down that one kind action to the credit side.’

A man who writes like this, ought to remember that the value of such assertions entirely depends on the authority of the speaker. We must candidly own, that the mere fact that a man wrote ‘Guy Livingstone’ does not inspire us with much confidence as to the correctness of what he has to say about the

day of judgment. If we are to have theology, let a man give his whole heart and soul to it. If we are to have a rattling novel about dogs, horses, boxing, gambling, and Byronic ferocity, perhaps it might be as well to leave Christianity alone. Merely to bow to it in passing, is a sort of insolence. No humane man or woman would make the remark attributed to Cornelia; but it is a strong thing to say, that a woman of whom we are told hardly anything, except that she was pretty, that she committed adultery, and that she fretted herself to death over the loss of her reputation, will eclipse the light of many orthodox virgins and dignified matrons; or that a man who does not know whether he gives a person 20*l.* or 25*l.*, will get credit for 5*l.* more in the latter case than in the former. Surely when we cannot possibly know anything, it is best to say nothing; and there is something offensive in stating as a fact the truth of an opinion on such subjects, merely because the person stating it hopes it may be true.

This habit is but one specimen amongst many of the inconveniences which necessarily attend novels written on the principle on which 'Guy Livingstone' is written. They, one and all, are meant to express a certain view of life in the loosest and most indefinite form. It is impossible to read such books, without seeing that the author is giving vent to a set of feelings and experiences which he has collected. All of them have a certain *blasé* air about them. They are a contrivance for enunciating idly, and without taking the trouble of definite arrangement, a set of impressions about the world which have grown up in the mind, and which do not exactly correspond with those which other people have put forward. Such views are, for the most part, crude and almost worthless, and when they are embodied in novels, they are invested with a false brilliancy, a false air of extent and profundity, and a degree of popularity totally disproportioned to their intrinsic value. For one person who has the will or the power to think, a thousand are ready to sympathise; and if a man possesses brilliancy enough to entertain, and imagination enough to interest, he may secure a vast amount of sympathy from vacant but susceptible people. It is an unmanly thing to have the sympathies moulded by such means as these, for, generally speaking, nothing can exceed the slightness and flimsiness of the doctrines thus preached, except the confidence of the preacher. They are a mere mouthful of froth. They say nothing, they prove nothing, they are nothing, but they addle a great many foolish brains, and prompt a vast deal of foolish conduct and unreasonable feeling.

- ART. IX. — 1. *The London Cotton Plant; a Journal of Tropical Civilisation.* Published for the Proprietors by C. MITCHELL. London: June, 1858.
2. *Report of the Special Committee on the Revival of the African Slave-trade, made to the Southern Convention at Montgomery, Alabama, May 10th, 1858.*
3. *Resolutions passed at a Public Meeting of Free Coloured Men, held at New Bedford, Massachusetts, on the 16th June, 1858.*

THE news of the abolition of the slave-trade reached Sir James Mackintosh when he was residing in India. He wrote from Bombay on the 27th of July of that memorable year 1807, of the impression that Mr. Wilberforce's victory made upon him, in these words: 'Who knows whether the greater part of the benefit that he has conferred on the world (the greatest that any individual has had the means of conferring) may not be the encouraging example that the exertions of virtue may be crowned by such splendid success? We are apt petulantly to express our wonder that so much exertion should be necessary to suppress such flagrant injustice. The more just reflection will be, that a short period of the life of one man is, well and wisely directed, sufficient to remedy the miseries of millions for ages. Benevolence has hitherto been too often disheartened by frequent failures. Hundreds and thousands will be animated by Mr. Wilberforce's example, by his success, and (let me use the word only in the moral sense of preserving his example) by a renown that can only perish with the world, to attack all the forms of corruption and cruelty that scourge mankind.* At the end of half a century from the writing of that letter, when the next generation of the Wilberforces and Mackintoshes had grown old, an alarm arose that the slave-trade was in course of revival by France, — or rather, by the Emperor of the French, — under a thin disguise; and that certain State governors in the United States were openly proposing a reopening of the African trade in negroes. One year more, and we find the French importation of negro labourers into Martinique, Guadaloupe, and Cayenne to be a real trade in slaves; the subject of a revived slave-trade to be the most important of the moment in the United States; and some English newspapers, adopting a tone,

* Life of Wilberforce, vol. iii. p. 302.

and putting forth sentiments, of which many a West India planter of the last generation would have been ashamed.

What then? Where is the change? What will be the result? What is to be done? What is to be expected? Is any conclusion arrived at? And what is it?

There is no change in the grounds on which slavery, and the trade which supplies it, have always been condemned by all good and impartial men. There is no change in the facts and reasons which condemn slavery as in every sense impolitic; as ruinous alike to the character and the fortunes of all who are implicated in it; as incompatible with political liberty and social welfare of every kind. There is therefore no change in the views and spirit of this Journal in relation to the infamous traffic by which the institution is upheld. We will venture to say that there never will be any change in the decision and energy with which the people of Great Britain will demand of their government all possible vigilance in the prevention of the traffic on the high seas, and all necessary resolution in keeping the Powers of the world to their treaty engagements in regard to the African race. This Journal was able to announce, in 1836*, that 'every Power of Europe has acknowledged that a solemn obligation is upon them to contribute to the abolition 'of the cursed traffic in our fellow-creatures.' The reasons which brought those Powers into the compact exist unchanged; and the compact must be fulfilled accordingly. What change there is is merely that which ordinarily ensues upon so vast and difficult a reform as the abolitionists inaugurated. It is a form of the reaction which selfish habits of mind and life are always urging, as long as the restoration of bad institutions can be conceived of by the sanguine egotist; and if the reaction seems to have any force at all, it is simply through the unreadiness of a generation which has long ceased to hear the subject discussed, but which has only to listen and to think, in order to see the truth as plainly as their fathers ever saw it, and to take care that the great work of their fathers shall never be reversed.

We are told by the retrogressive party that the subject is old and tiresome; the arguments against slave-labour worn out; the sentiment superannuated; the whole opposition an obsolete affair, which must give way to modern views and fresh interests. By way of presenting us with fresh and interesting matter, the organs of pro-slavery opinion, from Mr. Carlyle's pamphlets to the latest border-ruffian sermon in a far-west newspaper, serve up again conceptions and assumptions far more antique than

* Edinburgh Review, vol. lxiii. p. 387.

any anti-slavery publications have to show;—notions of the negro and his fate, of the planter and his prerogative, of the superiority of a life of indolence and debt to one of industry and independence;—assumptions as absurd to the man of business and the economist as they are shocking to the man of principle and feeling;—arguments old as tyranny, tiresome as egotism, silly and worn-out as mediæval arguments against antipodes, or vindications of the divine right of kings. The latest statements within our knowledge of the arguments on behalf of the slave-system, as it at present exists, are put forth by the new *Journal of the American slaveowners*, ‘*The London Cotton Plant*,’ the first number of which appeared in May last. One paragraph of the prospectus is this:—

‘Avowing our utter detestation of “slavery” in any form whatever, we hold that negro servitude to the white man is not human slavery, but the normal condition of the inferior race, and his natural relation in life. We hold that the negro is an inferior and specifically different MAN, and can only be christianised and civilised through daily contact with the superior race; that he must of necessity, by an organised system of labour, take a self-sustaining part in his own progress and improvement, and is utterly incapable as now constituted, of self-government, self-christianity, or self-civilisation. While we shall bring to the illustration of this philosophy the evidences of science and the clear deduction of well-fortified reason, we trust to maintain the argument with dignity and decorum, and a just regard for the prejudices and feelings of others.’*

Appended to this view of the negro, we do not observe any explanation of the remarkable circumstance that, throughout the Southern States of the Union, the negroes in ‘servitude’ afford a large proportion of the constituency which sends members to Congress. Three-fifths of the slaves count for as many votes; without which the Southern representation at Washington would be something very unlike what it is, and the Southern policy could never have predominated in the Capitol and in the Cabinet. If the negro is not a man, capable of political ideas and an organised social existence, it ought to be explained how he can, in any way, help to send representatives to Congress. The newest of London newspapers expands its doctrine thus in its third number. We need only premise that the discourse proceeds on the cool assumption that the negroes in our West India colonies have not done a stroke of work for twenty years, and that we, the people of England, have subscribed to maintain them in idleness, applauding their indolence, and endowing them with costly gifts of education and luxury. . On another occasion,

* *The London Cotton Plant*, June 12th, 1858.

we hope to show, fully and frankly, what our West India labourers have been doing for twenty years past, and what they are now accomplishing from season to season. At present, we can only hold up to the admiration of our readers the audacity which first assumes that the British West Indies are a scene of total idleness, and then argues thus on the assumption: —

‘It would be instructive to inquire exactly the amount requisite to keep in idleness 500,000 negroes for twenty years; to clothe them, to teach them, and thus upon an energetic, effective and grand scale, realise the wishes of those who believe that civilisation can be effected without being based upon organised and remunerative industry. Stating the result in one column, it would then be equally interesting to set forth the practical results of the opposite compulsory system of negro labour, wherein the negro pays for his own civilisation, adds materially to the general prosperity of the world, and is led along that path of labour which all nations have trod before him from the foundation of the first human society.’

The reader may well wonder what this journalist can be dreaming of. None of us have paid a shilling to support idle negroes; and, on the other hand, the substantial property of the class which declines intermittent work, paid at the rate of ninepence or a shilling a day, — property in land, in dwellings, in chapels, and in personal comforts, — must have been acquired by labour. The question is only between labour on the sugar estates of a small number of planters, and labour outside those plantations. The journalist proceeds: —

‘The actual state of negro servitude as it exists in America has never been understood in England, nor the theory of the American constitution, the organic law of which consists in the full recognition of the inferiority of the negro, and the natural superiority of the white man. The immediate representatives of the institution of negro servitude as a wise and just system of tropical labour, of course have a conscientious and honest conviction in regard to the matter. The Southern philosophy is this: that negro servitude is not “slavery” at all in the true acceptance of that term; that involuntary servitude to the white man is the normal condition of the negro, his natural relation in life, and is the same measure of freedom to him as what we call “liberty” is to the white man; that in this relation he finds his greatest happiness, makes the greatest progress, and is of the best service; that in no other relation has he ever been found except as a barbarian of the lowest grade, or when sustained in unnatural freedom by a mistaken philanthropy; that the negro must either be in christian servitude or in heathen and barbarian slavery; and that every dictate of wise economy, true charity, and honest intention enforces the necessity of making him take an active and productive part in his own civilisation.’*

* The London Cotton Plant, June 26th, 1858, p. 37.

We need not waste our space on any exposure of the amount of nonsense contained in this paragraph of what the authors call 'Southern philosophy.' We will simply remind our readers that this sort of philosophy is no better in the eyes of twenty-five millions of the inhabitants of the United States than in ours. The largest allowance gives to the slaveholding class in the United States, — the owners, their families and connexions, — the number of two millions, out of the total population of twenty-seven millions at the time of the census of 1850. Of these, only 350,000 at the utmost are actual holders of slaves: and, further, the earnest, determined, deliberate defenders of the 'philosophy,' and of its concrete form, are believed to be not more than one thousand persons, and probably less. We say this merely to prevent a whole nation being charged with entertaining such notions of matters of fact, and contenting themselves with such logic as we see sprouting from this young *Cotton Plant*.

Its appearance in London, however, and its rapturous references to Mr. Carlyle and quotations from the 'Times,' may warn us that one of those occasions has arisen, on which, according to Sir James Mackintosh, 'hundreds and thousands' will be animated by Mr. Wilberforce's example 'to attack all the 'forms of corruption and cruelty' that can cover a revived slave-trade. It is too true that a vehement effort is made just now to reopen the African slave-trade, for purposes which we propose to exhibit; by means which we hope to expose; and in reliance on the indifference of a new generation, which yet, we are certain, needs only to be warned of the danger to show a spirit as generous, convictions as clear, and a temper as persistent as those of their fathers. Our own belief is very confident; — that the slave-trade is approaching its extinction; that the present reactionary effort is a sign of its extreme peril; and that the effort itself, if properly turned to account, will accelerate the certain victory of free over slave labour. We do not say that the result will come of itself; nor that the settlement of the question will be at all easy or agreeable. On the contrary, there is nothing that we are so sure of as that every Englishman who has ever felt satisfaction in the work achieved by his country in her colonies, and among the governments of the civilised world, is at present under the obligation to watch the course of events at home and abroad in order to sustain the free-labour policy of the last half century, to stimulate the Government to maintain the honour of England, to give support and sympathy to every sincere and active ally, and to provide the necessary spur or check for every Power, great or small, which hangs back from

the terms, or bolts from the course agreed upon by all, for the welfare of human society. Whether there be more or less of the old battle to be fought over again, the thing must be done; and every man ought to qualify himself to take his part in it, at a time when the American slaveholders undertake to teach us, in our own London, who the negro is, what slavery is, and that the 'Free-negro theory of Wilberforce, Brougham and Clarkson' ought to be opposed 'on the broad ground of civilisation and 'humanity.' There can be no better encouragement to the requisite action than a survey of the plain, clear facts of the two cases, — of free-labour and slaveholding; and we prefer that method of appeal to any other, simply because the zeal which the occasion requires must be kindled through the understanding. We will not give to 'Southern philosophers' the advantage of a sneer at our enthusiasm or our prejudices. They will not be able to ridicule us as sentimental philanthropists, or to rouse disgust against us as 'nigger-worshippers.' We have nothing to say at present in the character of Protector-of-Negroes. We have at least as much tenderness for the white men. We speak in the general interest of civilisation and human progress, in admiration of the part taken by our country in extinguishing the most fatal of barbaric institutions, and in simple fidelity to a policy with which the reputation of Great Britain is bound up.

'Are we to have all that old argument over again, as the "Times" warned us we should?' some reader may say. 'We know all about the slave hunts in Africa, and the impossibility of industry and innocent commerce in the presence of the trade in men; and the horrors of the middle-passage, and the cruelties of the plantation; and the deterioration of land and waste of property in slaveholding countries, and the corruption of morals among the superior race, and the exclusion of the inferior from genuine domestic life; and the invariable tendency of slaveholding States to a military despotism, and their necessary retrogression when countries which resort to the other system of labour are advancing. We know all this, and plenty more on the same side. Must we listen to it all over again? Are you going to bring up the obsolete feelings and indurated arguments of the last generation?'

Certainly not. As those reasonings have never been overthrown, they stand good of themselves. The real difference between our materials and those of our fathers is that we have, thanks to them, a new species of evidence to produce. The results of the intervening period are not only a new sort of evidence, fresh and interesting, but affording a new kind and degree of value. It is this perpetual growth of fresh evidence

which always prevents sound social questions from perishing through exhaustion. It is only by an indolent or unskilful use of them that they can become wearisome. The fresh phenomena, which grow out of every passing season, afford the soundest and most interesting arguments: and thus it is not true of the question of the slave-trade, any more than of any vital controversy on matters of social principle and practice, that the issue must be left to fate because men cannot be induced to attend to it. There has been hitherto no opportunity of understanding and presenting the evidence appropriate to the present time; that of the operation of the slave-trade and slavery on the countries and peoples where it has existed after being got rid of by the rest of the civilised world. The United States stand first in all eyes among the very few countries which still come under this description. Brazil having actually retired from the slave-trade, the United States and Cuba are generally regarded as the two countries which sustain the traffic. France—or rather the French Government—has recently been ranked with these two, on account of the real, though disguised, slave-trade to her West India colonies; but, as this new crime may be soon repented of (on account of its folly, if not its guilt), we may adhere to the usual classification,—the United States and Cuba against the world. We are bound to take the independent and self-governing country for examination before the colony, which may plead the nondescript character of the home-government on which it depends. Let us then trace, rapidly but carefully, the relations between the slave-trade and slavery and the political and social condition of the North American republic, including the foreign policy of the United States and their place in the world at this hour. The time is suitable, for it is one of crisis in the Republic. All leading men, and all the separate sovereign States agree, if on no other point, in declaring that some sort of revolutionary crisis is at hand, and that the institution of slavery is the cause. There could not be a better time for investigating the real relation between the old element and the new changes; and we believe ourselves to be safe from all reproach as to the worn-out character of our inquiry. As far as we know, it is, as a body of evidence, altogether untouched.

When the Americans of our time complain of their ‘geographical difficulty’ (as they do in London to this hour), declaring that an equal distribution of slaves over their territory would have preserved their Republic in unimpaired moral glory, they should remember two or three particulars which they are apt to overlook. They should remember the diversities in the original settlement of the various States: they should remember that

the worn-out plea of diversity of climate is now excluded by the attempt to establish slavery in Kansas; and, in a converse way, by the superior success of free-labour culture of cotton and tobacco, now that the experiment has been fairly tried in Texas, and on estates in Virginia and elsewhere. They should remember that the old and once-true complaint that England introduced slavery into their country related only to the mild form of slavery which existed in the last century, when it was common in all the States; and that when the southern section insisted, in 1819, on the permanent establishment, and in 1854 on the extension, of the institution, it made the Republic answerable, from that time forwards, for American slavery, and for all the aggravations which were sure to accrue after such an adoption. In a very small space we may compare the earlier phase with the later — the British importation of slavery with the present indigenous sort, which is the express choice and demand of the citizens who have risked everything else to perpetuate it.

We need not explain what the first settlers in New England were like, nor how well disposed they were to work with their own hands. Their opposition to the introduction of negro labour was no less marked: and it was simply through the cupidity of piratical skippers that negroes were speculatively introduced into Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia, against the will of the inhabitants at large. While yet the blacks were not indispensable for their labour, and before the increase of the mulatto class suggested the profitableness of slave-breeding for the market, the institution had some external appearance of the patriarchal character claimed for it by 'The London Cotton Plant,' and by pro-slavery cant in general. But with the spread of the trade in negroes, this character disappeared.

When Lafayette visited the United States in 1825, he remarked with grave concern the deteriorated relation between the whites and the coloured race, in the free States as well as in the South. The last time he was there, he said, there was none of the antipathy to the negroes that exists in this century. Men of the two races stood shoulder to shoulder in the ranks; and they ate and slept side by side in their bivouac. The free negroes and the 'following' of the planters were regarded and addressed as 'citizens.' This, indeed, was still the case as late as the last British war, when General Jackson issued addresses, before and after the battle of New Orleans, in which the blacks were called on as citizens to defend their country, or thanked for having done so with true citizen zeal. We need not describe what Lafayette found in 1825, in contrast with his

early impressions. Yet, in presence of the comparatively good understanding which existed at the time of the revolution, there were many,—and Washington was one of them,—who doubted whether any permanent union could be effected between States which had a slave-trade and those which had none. The Northern States had slaves, but no organised slave-trade. The South had both. When the Convention was at work on the Constitution, a member of it saw Washington walking, wrapt in thought, on the bank of the Schuylkill, and, joining him, learned what he was thinking about. He was meditating whether it would not be better for the Convention to separate without proposing any constitution at all, though its details were nearly completed;—so doubtful did it appear to him whether it would not be wiser to await the guidance of events than to commit the principles of republicanism to the chances of compromise. When we have seen how the compromises of that instrument have ruled the destinies of the Republic and brought it to the verge of revolution, we may see how some of the truest American patriots may regret, without treason, that Washington did not decide to pause. He and all his coadjutors took for granted that slavery would expire before long, in consequence of its manifest inconveniences, and of the disposition in the northern territories to get rid of it; and the growth of the labour-supply in a flourishing young republic might be confidently reckoned on to render the emancipation easy; but the negro-trading in the South was the difficulty. All the world knows that the compromise was made; but all the world may not know, or may not remember, what the compromise was. It is as well to understand and remember it, as our recent difficulties at Washington, and the present attempts at reviving the African slave-trade, are among the consequences of it. The compromise was this: the Northern States consented to the artifice of reckoning three-fifths of the slaves as whites, and the South agreed to a taxation proportioned to its nominal constituency. The North permitted an interval of twenty years before the arrest of the African Slave-trade, and the South agreed to an equal representation in the Senate of States of all dimensions, though the small States were Northern ones. The most fatal provision of the series was that which bound the citizens of all the States to deliver up to claimants ‘persons held to labour and service ‘escaping from another State.’ The word ‘slave’ does not appear at all in any constitutional document from that date onwards; and the term disappeared till revived by the Abolitionists. The hope was, that the substitution of the words ‘servant’ and ‘service,’ for ‘slave’ and ‘slavery,’ would assist the corre-

sponding conversion of the things themselves; a strange expectation, while the traffic in human beings went on by sea and land!

These compromises had ceased to work well by 1825. The Northern States had long abolished slavery, and escaped the penalty of regarding labour as disgraceful. But they had yielded to the bribery of the South more than they have ever retrieved. One constitutional safeguard after another was surrendered for some brilliant immediate advantage, till the internal slave-trade had become the organic disease of the Republic which it is now admitted to be. In short, the inevitable change was now coming over the American character which, we have a right to suppose, might have been escaped if the labour-market had not been early corrupted. The yeomanry of Massachusetts, the fishermen of Maine, the merchants and captains of Rhode Island and New York, the Dutch and German traders and farmers of New York and Pennsylvania, never showed any vagrant tendencies nor any buccaneering ambition, till the influence of the South acted upon the worst part of their natures through the predisposition of sectional jealousy. Since the regular establishment of an internal slave-trade, there has always been a bad social element drawn from the North, a floating population of thoughtless and idle young men or broken down elders, who wanted adventure, or fancied they could grow rich in a hurry by extending the area of southern slavery. A more numerous reinforcement, of a far lower character, from the slave States,—fellows of the bully and rowdy sort, such as have figured in the Kansas drama,—have depressed the national character incalculably, and the national reputation almost irreparably, through the factitious demand for new territory on which to employ the slaves who had worn out the old. Hence the whole invention and prosecution of *filibustering*; hence the wars, Mexican and other, and the annexations, Texan and other, which have created a world-wide distrust of the American republic, as the great buccaneering Power of the coming time.

Before considering the history of this phase, however, we must draw the attention of our readers to an incident in the life of the American slave-trade which has not been duly appreciated in England, even where it has been known as a matter of fact. It would have been a great advantage to some of our legislators who spoke on the case of the 'Regina Coeli' in June last to have known more of the history and condition of the settlement of Liberia. For want of such information as the American slaveholders or abolitionists could furnish at any time, the opportunity of exposing the new 'disguised French slave-trade' was nearly lost. Our information is derived from

full communication with the advocates and opponents of the scheme of African Colonisation. We have learned, from the highest office-bearers of the Society, all that was to be said on behalf of it; and the facts on the other side have been so openly placed before the American public by witnesses of character, and so long acted upon by others who had means of knowing the truth, that we offer their statements without any doubt—whatever of their substantial truth. We may add that the strongest confirmation that could be obtained is afforded by the recent transactions of French agents in Liberia, and comments on them by residents there.

Our elder readers may possibly remember the advent, in 1832, of an American traveller, named Elliot Cresson, who lectured all over this kingdom on behalf of what he represented as a new scheme, set on foot by American philanthropists, for putting an end to slavery, by restoring the people of colour to 'their native Africa,' where they would act as missionaries, and introduce civilisation and Christianity among the barbaric tribes. It will perhaps make some of us a little uneasy to remember the extreme facility with which Mr. Cresson led away thousands of people,—members of the religious or philanthropic world chiefly, but not entirely. He had a large variety of inducements to present, according to exigencies; and they were not always compatible: but it took some time to find that out. He promised to merchants a new branch of trade; to popular authors a picturesque new subject; to scientific men a new route into the heart of Africa. The missionary world looked for the evangelising of Africa; and the anti-slavery party for the abolition of American slavery. Mr. Cresson had a remarkable faculty, which proved a great resource in lecturing,—of supposing whatever he asked to be promised: so that he announced from the hustings various successes, engagements, and pledges which were purely imaginary. The venerable James Cropper of Liverpool, hearing in this way the announcement by Mr. Cresson of a forthcoming tale, the scene of which would be laid in the paradisiacal territory of Liberia, wrote to the author, a perfect stranger, offering to pay the expenses of the whole stereotyped edition, if the author would pause to learn the merits of the Colonisation Society and its scheme,—the result of which inquiry would certainly be the suppression of the work. The reply, by return of post, was that no such work was in existence, or had ever been promised to Mr. Cresson, though the topic had been made by Mr. Cresson his excuse for introducing himself. Suspicion seems to have been awakened pretty early by the vehemence and pertinacity with which Mr. Cresson denounced

Mr. Garrison, who had just been in England. Inquiry being thus stimulated, it was discovered that Mr. Garrison had once been an admirer and a member of the Colonisation Society; but that he had early satisfied himself that the whole scheme was an invention of the slaveholders of the Southern States, to relieve themselves of the presence of free negroes, and enable them to perpetuate slavery by keeping their own slave-trade well in hand, while beguiling the free States with the delusion of a gradual emancipation, and of an ultimate complete riddance of the coloured population. So many persons recovered their senses from day to day that Mr. Cresson's career in England was but a short one. Some began to wonder how Africa could be called the native land of any negroes in America but those who, being imported before 1808, were too old for colonisation: and it was not clear that American negroes would like the removal. Others inquired whether slaves could be qualified to be missionaries: while practical people calculated how long it would take to remove the millions of the coloured race, and how they could possibly be supported in Liberia if even the mere annual increase were turned out on the African coast. Mr. Cresson had had time, however, to receive not a little money in sums of 7*l.* 10*s.*, which he declared was the amount required to convert an American slave into an African free man. He said he did not ask for money; but he always took it: and many were the little children who emptied their purses into his hand, and the maid servants who gave him their hoarded shillings, thankful to help in releasing a slave,—not perceiving till it was pointed out to them that this was slave-trading in fact, and that there ought to be some security that the vacant place would not be immediately filled by a new victim. The first check given to this bounty was administered by the anti-slavery leaders, — Wilberforce, Buxton, the Croppers, Sir George Stephen, and others, — who issued in 1833 their protest against any support of the scheme in England, on the ground of its being 'an obstruction' to the abolition of slavery, an embodiment of a malignant hatred of the free blacks, a compulsory method of getting rid of those people, an encouragement to persecution in America, and a snare by which the unwary would be diverted from the true anti-slavery aim. The Americans might establish a colony in Africa, if it was found desirable; but it would be a fatal mistake for Englishmen to regard it as a means of abolishing slavery, or checking the slave-trade. Mr. Clarkson's name does not appear among the signatures to this protest: he took time to satisfy himself, finding it difficult to resist the influence which Mr. Cresson had obtained over him by his bright and soothing repre-

sentations: but in 1840 he published his final opinion: viz., that the objects of the Colonisation Society were 'entirely impracticable.' He observed that this was enough to justify his secession: but that he had something to add: — that if slaves were what their owners declared them to be, they would corrupt, instead of evangelising Africa: and that, on the other hand, if only enlightened free negroes were sent, slavery in the United States would be unaffected, unless indeed it were confirmed by such a deportation. Again, the founders and officeholders of the society were slaveholders, who openly declared the negro race to be not human, but something inferior. This opened the good man's eyes to 'the diabolical scheme,' as he finally called it; and he publicly notified, in a letter to Garrison, that he had 'washed his hands clean for ever of the undertaking.' — This was all that the English public had to do with Liberia for nearly twenty years, except that a few hardly-prejudiced or softly-disposed persons refused to hear any evil-speaking of Liberia; and that some few, very few, attended to the fact that our Government had, at length, recognised the State of Liberia, and signed a treaty with its President. The case of the '*Regina Cœli*' is a strong appeal to us to look at the facts again. The American story meantime was this.

When Mr. Cresson appeared among us in 1832, the Society which sent him had existed sixteen years, — a fact which we cannot recall his having stated. It was founded at Washington, and speedily propagated through the Southern States, when once the early jealousy of the planters was explained away. At the first meeting, Mr. Clay applied himself to dissipate this jealousy, declaring that, being himself the owner 'of a certain species of property,' he would oppose with the utmost firmness every project 'which could affect in any manner the tenure' by which it was held. 'Nor,' he said, 'am I prepared to go as far as the gentleman who has just spoken, in saying that I would emancipate my slaves, if the means were provided of sending them from the country.' We may add here, that Mr. Clay, during the many years that he was Vice-President and President of the Society, never freed any slaves, though he parted with some in other ways; and that in the provisions of his celebrated will, by which it is pretended that Liberia will be the ultimate destination of the youngest generation of his slaves, the date fixed for their emancipation is more distant than the extreme limit which Mr. Clay was in the habit of assigning to slavery itself. Before Mr. Clay, Mr. Madison was President of the Society, and he, too, sent no negroes to Africa, while he sold many from his own door. At that

first meeting of the Society, Randolph of Roanoke commended the scheme as 'one of the greatest securities' of slave property. From one Report to another of the annual meetings, we find the same assurance anxiously repeated. Not a single slave was to be touched by the scheme; but their subjection would be secured by the removal of the free blacks. It is true, the free blacks refused to go; but a Virginia planter, Mr. Brodnax, declared publicly that their 'consent' must be obtained, as it had hitherto for a course of years been obtained, — 'by the gentle admonition of a severe flagellation.' A partner in a ship employed on the scheme, a Mr. Stanton, inquired why, having driven away the red man, the black man should not also be got rid of. Governor Wise, now a candidate for the Presidential chair, insisted on 'the great original principle on which the Society was founded, — friendship to the slaveholders.' The Rev. J. M. Pease approved the scheme because 'its genius' did not interfere with 'the providential arrangement' by which the inferior race lives in bondage to the higher. We might fill pages with such testimonies; but we must hasten to show the practical results of a scheme which, at one time or another, included almost every eminent man in the country, from Webster, in New England, to Judge Porter, in New Orleans; which had possession of the pulpits and the press of nearly the whole Union; which was sustained by votes of Congress, and of various State legislatures; and which appealed to the most pressing interest, and the most vehement and pervading prejudice of the white population.

In 1835, Mr. Clay was in the habit, we are sorry to say, of directing the attention of foreigners, and of persons of tender conscience, to this Society as the agency by which slavery would ultimately be abolished in the United States. Some who knew nothing of his prior declarations as to the opposite purpose of the scheme, inquired of him, in virtue of his being Vice-President, how such an organisation as the Society exhibited could deal with the increasing numbers of the negroes. One, at least, asked whether the entire disposable marine of the country could convey away even the annual increase of the mere slave population, — that contemporaneous increase being afterwards shown by the Census report to be upwards of 60,000. Another question was, how such a multitude were to be fed on a patch of African coast when they got there. Mr. Clay rapped his snuff-box, and replied, that in a few years he hoped it would be done! What had been effected thus far to encourage such a hope? How far had the Society fulfilled its promise of 'providing a peaceful exit from slavery?' During the first

twenty years, the number carried to both settlements — Liberia and Cape Palmas — was under 3000, though the machinery of transportation was used to get rid of slaves inconvenient from either too much or too little capacity; scarred, stupified, helpless wretches, as we hear from the African side, and ‘bright boys,’ who think and feel too much for the safety of the plantation. In 1853, when the Society was in its thirty-sixth year, it had removed 8500 to Africa. When our readers are reminded that the annual increase of the mere slaves was 60,000 during Mr. Clay’s Presidentship of the Society, they will not require us to dwell longer on the proportion of means to ends in the case.

It was enough for all but very thoughtless people that the Southern planters were vehemently jealous of the immigration of Europeans into the Northern States. While the wealthy North was more hated every year for the prosperity which grew out of an adequate supply of labour, it was not credible that the South was really sending any labourers away. American shipping was not in fact passing to and fro across the ocean for the purpose of pouring labourers into the North, and deporting them from the South. The use that *was* made of the scheme, in this view, is now fully understood. No truer information is ever given to the European traveller in America than in the saying that the condition of the cotton crop determines the shipments of negroes to Liberia. Trifling as they always are, the largest deportations take place when cotton is lowest; that being the time when the plantation is weeded of its least valuable slaves. Between 1820 and 1830 a larger number were sent than before, or for some time after, — cotton prices being nearly stationary during that time. Through the next ten years, cotton was nearly doubled in value, and little was heard of Liberia. During the last rise in cotton and slaves, the subject seemed to be dropped. The agency was kept up, however; and the case of the ‘*Regina Cœli*’ may show us why.

Before we glance at the African phase of the institution, however, we will bring up the American story to the present date. Those who have read Mr. Webb’s tale, ‘*The Garies and their Friends*,’ will be less surprised than others at some recent movements of the free negroes of the United States. Persons of any complexion who, like the personages in Mr. Webb’s book, are in the possession of houses, shipping, stores, funded property, and other forms of wealth, are likely to have an intelligence and a will of their own as to where and how they will live, and what they will do. A race, however depressed, which produces clergy, physicians, lawyers, professors and ar-

tists, will be pretty well able to hold a practical citizenship, though the judges decide that men of colour cannot register coasting-vessels, or purchase a land-title; and even though the Supreme Court declares that 'the black man has no rights which the white man is bound to respect.' In spite of all such dispiriting influences, the free negroes are assuming a social position which points significantly to an approaching annihilation of the slave-trade, while it settles the fate of Liberia and its adjuncts. For some time past we have observed signs of a determination on the part of leading free negroes to raise their class above that doom of mere menial labour to which their countrymen have hitherto consigned them. They will not henceforth be only barbers and porters, and hotel-waiters, and hack-drivers, and hangers-on where there is dirty work to be done. But the most remarkable demonstration is that of the present year, in which the lead is taken by the free-coloured men of New Bedford, a flourishing commercial city in Massachusetts. If we had space for the whole series of resolutions passed by them at a public meeting on the 16th of June last, our readers would find them interesting; but we must content ourselves with citing those which refer to the colonisation scheme. The preamble declared the grounds on which the meeting believed that the American Government desired three things in regard to their class: its enslavement, its expatriation, and its extirpation as a social element; and the resolutions which followed contemplated the three provisions. In regard to expatriation, they declared that no attempts to banish them, by rendering their grievances permanent, and increasingly intolerable, should make them give up their native land. 'We believe,' they say, 'the design is, now more than ever before, to make our grievances permanent, by greatly multiplying the disabilities under which we labour; nevertheless, we are determined to remain in this country, our right and title being as clear and indisputable as that of any class of people.' Such resolutions, following forty-one years' trial of American colonisation in Africa, spares all doubt as to the effect of Liberia in extinguishing slavery and the slave-trade. We must now take a rapid glance at the remaining aspect of the scheme, and see whether the influence of Liberia may not in fact be enlisted on the other side.

The territory chosen for the American settlement was one which flourished well before the slave-traders found it. Along the river St. Paul, and between that and the Mesurado, an agricultural population lived in a succession of villages, extending two miles inward from the river banks. After the appear-

ance of slave-ships off the coast, all became barren. The people were carried off or dispersed, and the hamlets burned. The Colonisation Society chose a strip of coast, about 300 miles long, and of varying extent towards the interior. It has several rivers, but they are rapid, with rocky channels, and apt to form sandbanks at their mouths, where there are no materials for a good anchorage. Monrovia, the capital of Liberia, is ill-placed for ventilation, and therefore health; and it is difficult of access from the sea. It has never had the life-like appearance of a place of business; and the depression caused by the first aspect, on mounting the wretched roads to it, is confirmed by all that is seen elsewhere. At the time that Mr. Cresson was extolling in England the climate, productions, and American population of Liberia (in 1832), Mr. Laird was at Monrovia obtaining that information about the free-negro scheme which he soon after published. He at once discovered that the colony was a mere device for ridding American slaveholders of troublesome negroes, free or slave. The former told him how they had been made wretched by oppression at home, and then betrayed into this hungry wilderness by representations of its being a paradise. The condition of the colony five years later accorded with Mr. Laird's description.

The name of the Bacon family of New England is well known in this country. The Rev. Leonard Bacon is an eminent professor at a New England University; and his brother, Dr. Bacon, is the enlightened and intrepid physician to whom we chiefly owe the exposure of the slave-trading character of the Liberian colony. Dr. Bacon went forth 'an enthusiastic promoter' of the enterprise, — misled, like Webster, and like Garrison himself, by the specious pretences of the scheme. He landed in Liberia in 1837, and lived there nearly two years, spending a third year on other parts of the coast. He found the number of Americans to be at the utmost 5000, to 80,000 natives. He found Roberts, now known as the late President of the Republic of Liberia, acting as the agent and factor of the great slave-trader, Pedro Blanco. He found John N. Lewis, Secretary of the Colony, also an agent of Blanco's. He found Payne, known as the Missionary Payne, a regular workman at the slave factory of New Sesters. Roberts was employed in purchasing condemned vessels at Sierra Leone for Blanco's use as slavers; and Lewis stored the goods and merchandisc which were to be bartered for slaves. It was known in America that one of the branches of industry on the spot was the forging of shackles for the slave cargoes carried off from the coast. Thousands of dollars were received by these three agents from

the slave-traders; and from 1835 to 1840, the colony was one of the chief auxiliaries of the traffic which it pretended to supersede. Dr. Bacon saw as many as six slave-ships anchored at once before Monrovia; and while they were present no other method of industry than stocking them was thought of. We have not space for the details of the scheme by which condemned vessels at Sierra Leone (which could not be legally purchased 'by the English agent of Pedro Blanco, nor by Spaniards in person,) were bought by Roberts, removed under the American or the Liberian flag, and subsequently transferred, through a third person, to Blanco, at his great establishment at Gallinhas. Dr. Bacon kept his eye on one vessel, — the slave-schooner which Roberts christened the 'Monrovia,' — and which, after lying idle till attention was supposed to be diverted from it, was laden with slaves from Gallinhas for Havannah, where she arrived under another name. The whole narrative, with all the objections unavailingly brought against it, may be found in the 'New York Day-Book,' of July 11th and 15th, 1848. Dr. Bacon was an eye-witness of the slave-trading at Gallinhas and New Sesters, during two voyages which he took along the coast; the vessels in which he was a passenger having business with the slave-traders in both places. So much for the occupation of the colony. What of its condition?

Dr. Bacon left the colony simply because the deficiency of food rendered his self-sacrifice useless. He was willing to bear hardship himself; but he could not keep his patients alive. His convalescents sank through hunger. Some of the colonists ran through the bush, and overtook him when he was stepping into the boat to depart, imploring him, as they implored every man who was so fortunate as to get away, to take them with him, — anywhere, and in any capacity, if they could only escape from that horrible place. No one took care of the immigrants; and everybody robbed them. The colonists beat the natives, pillaged them, starved them; — these colonists being the 'missionaries' who were to evangelise Africa. 'Here,' said a clergyman on the colonisation platform in America, 'they are nuisances: there they will be missionaries.'

It may be said that this happened long ago; matters may have mended since. Not so, however. Before us lies a series of published letters from the colony, dated from March to June, 1854, which gives a more appalling representation than even Dr. Bacon's. These letters are understood to be (and the signature leaves no doubt of it) by one of the missionaries sent out by the Colonisation Society, — Mr. Augustus Washington. All considerations induced him to think and say the best he

could of the settlement: but the anguish of the spectacle overcame all restrictions and all prudence; and, with much fear and trembling, such as the black agent of white slaveholders was likely to feel, he wrote the truth to the New York 'Tribune,' by which it was published to the world. 'Ninety-five per cent. of all who come here with nothing,' he says, 'endure suffering and death to an extent almost incredible.' What of those who came with something? The 'Morgan Dix' brought 151 immigrants, negroes, 'all well' on arrival, and fully supplied with agricultural implements, a saw-mill, &c. It arrived at the close of 1851; and in two years the only question was whether the survivors were nine or fourteen. Other such companies lost only a third of their number, or less: but the mortality is always frightful; and those who fare best do it by the exercise of a fearful tyranny. The immigrants play the slaveholder over the native niggers; they complain that the missionaries make the people insolent and restless; and they 'keep the cow-hide handy,' for application 'in nearly all families,' by boys, women, 'and gentlemen of rank and standing, calling themselves Christians.' The starving immigrants are sent up the rivers, out of begging distance. The sick are hidden away in wattle huts when British vessels are looked for; and the dead are thrust underground 'in old gun-boxes.' It is of importance that the disposition of the immigrant population should be noted. It is this. Those who carry money can grow rich rapidly; they purchase from British ships, and sell their goods at a vast profit, because nothing of the sort is produced in the colony. In regard to the commonest necessities, they can make the highest profits. The next class is not much larger. It consists of men who can do a little carpentering or other artisan labour, and who are thereby encouraged to settle, to break up a piece of ground for a garden, and to rear poultry. A few more simply squat, and raise rice and cassava enough for themselves, without attempting more. The mass of the immigrants, however, disappear: 'bondmen, scarred, worn out, and expatriated;' 'poor miserable slaves, that are thrown on their shores nearly all destitute of means to help themselves.' These are sent 'up the rivers,' and when far enough off not to incommode the people on the coast they are dropped into the native huts, or left to shift for themselves. Till very recently it was supposed that this largest class of American immigrants was really lost sight of, and done with. There is now reason for suspicion that it is not so.

It appears that some time before the Emperor of the French made his contract with M. Regis and Co. for carrying free

negroes to the French colonies, the President of Liberia (Roberts) delighted the House of Assembly by announcing in his message a gift from the Emperor of the French of 1000 stand of arms. This will appear to our readers very odd till they hear of further transactions. For some distance from Monrovia the shore presents for many miles only one phenomenon besides the villages, and the interminable forests of mangrove and acacia; and that one object is a slave barracoen here and there. Here did the agents of M. Regis repair for their cargo; and here they purchased a number of 'labourers' from a notorious slave-dealer. But a difficulty occurred. The ship must clear out from Monrovia, because there was no other port that would serve; and the Liberian laws (the ground of alliance with England and other Powers) prohibit the exportation of *emigrants* without passports. First the French agents were found employing menaces to induce the President (Benson) to grant a general passport to the whole company of negroes they had just obtained by purchase. The tale of the 'Regina Cœli' is the next illustration of the case. On the 29th of October last, says the French account, cited by Lord Malmesbury in the House of Lords, Captain Simon, of the 'Regina Cœli,' having been urged to fill his vessel from that part of the coast, paid to the authorities the sum of 1564 piastres as passport duty for 400 labourers, who should be supplied to him in the course of forty days. Of these, 271 were on board, and the rest ready to embark, when the scuffle arose on which so much dispute has since hung. The 'emigrants' murdered several of the crew, and then took possession of the ship. They would not allow the captain (who was on shore at the time) to approach the vessel, but at length delivered it to the British consul, who sent the 'Ethiope' to take charge of the 'Regina Cœli.' Captain Simon protested against any claim in regard to his ship; and a French man-of-war appeared on the scene to carry her off.

The 'emigrants' meantime attempted to swim ashore, their 'manacles' having been removed before the English boarded the ship. Many were drowned, and more escaped up the country. There was some speculation in Parliament, as elsewhere, about these emigrants, as to who they were, and how they came to be manacled, and to rise upon the crew, if they were free and willing to go. Our readers will not be surprised, after what we have shown of the character of Liberia, at the French boast that these men were not debased native Africans, but 'free Americans,' who would have carried the Christian civilisation of their native land, and the habits and man-

ners of American society, to the French colonies. Our readers will also need little suggestion now as to what becomes of the mass of American 'immigrants' who disappear up the rivers after being landed. The puzzle in Parliament was to make out whether Captain Simon's company of passengers came from up the rivers, or from the settlement on the shore. They were Americans (the French say), and yet they did not apparently come from Monrovia or the neighbourhood. Can we not solve the difficulty? And can it be necessary to direct attention to the glimpses we seem now to be obtaining of a system by which American planters philanthropically deport negroes to Liberia, and French planters benevolently import negroes from Liberia, paying head-money under the name of passport duty, and incurring the risk of mutiny from the free and voluntary labourers who, as soon as released from 'manacles,' kill the crew and swim off to shore?

While we are writing, the Liberian and American accounts of the transaction arrive. The Judge of the Liberia Court of Probate, Mr. B. B. R. James, writes from New York, under the date of the 15th of July. He declares that President Benson did accede to the French captain's proposal to engage labourers on the coast, as, indeed, the President's preceding message informed the Legislature; that Captain Simon did obtain a large number from the chief at Cape Mount; that there was great eagerness on the part of residents to supply such labourers, on account of the extreme poverty of the place; but that the emigrants themselves had no notion of being penned up on board ship, and rose upon the crew accordingly, after several previous unsuccessful attempts; and that 300 of them got to shore. 'Not till then,' the Judge continues, 'did the Government of Liberia know by what means these emigrants had been procured. It appears that the greater number of them had been kidnapped and forced aboard that ship, making it nothing more nor less than the actual slave-trade.' From other Liberian authorities, we learn a remarkable fact, in connexion with French patronage of the settlement. The Emperor promised to present the Republic of Liberia with a war-brig; some add, because the schooner given by the British Government had become unseaworthy. A time and place was appointed for the transfer of the war-brig; but the Emperor revoked his promise, and sent the vessel to serve his own colonies, because the Liberian authorities were not sufficiently accommodating in promoting the new French slave-trade. The defence of the Colonisation Society consists mainly of the denial of the particulars of the French defence; denial that the

'emigrants' were Americans; denial that 200 of them could, as the French surgeon declares, read; denial that the passport duty could have amounted to the sum alleged. Assuming that the emigrants were natives, they are said to have been terrified at their fetters and confinement on board the 'Regina Coeli,' and hence their rebellion; and, again, we are assured that the precautions against the inveigling away of the natives are so express, that the authorities in Liberia could not possibly have been cognisant of the enterprise, as they are alleged by the French to have been. The result, so far, is that the French deny the fetters and the native African character of the emigrants, declaring them to be free Americans, 200 of whom could read; and that the President and other authorities sanctioned the scheme, and took the money. The Colonisation Society, on the other hand, declares that the victims were wild natives, that they were fettered and confined on board; and that there must be some mistake about the money, as the President and his officers could have known nothing of this application of the new French method of slave-trading. Another party now comes forward with its comment,—the American public, which is a disinterested judge, like ourselves, of the whole transaction. The 'New York Times' analyses the defence of the Colonisation Society, and finds it open to grave question; and it thus concludes:—

'We state these points, and would urge them upon the Colonisation people, because we believe the entire purgation of the Liberians from this accusation to be highly important. The exculpation will be worthless if partial. Since we abandoned the traffic in the United States, and since we are suspected the world over of desiring to resume it, the allegation that an American colony on the African coast is actually tampering with the vile business does us infinite mischief. It suggests a doubt whether these anti-slavery settlements were not designed to recruit our slave-markets; and it calls our sincerity in question, when we declare our freedom from all thought of returning to negro-stealing. The entire exoneration of President Benson is therefore of no slight consequence. Let us have it, if practicable.*'

The French commentary on the case may be presented in brief space. The 'Moniteur de la Flotte' tells us that the title of French consular agent has been withdrawn from the British consul at Monrovia, and that a special consul will probably be immediately appointed, 'to represent the interests of France on the coast, and which are every day becoming more extensive, to the great but unjust displeasure of England.' Meantime, the Emperor has bestowed the Cross of the Legion of Honour

* July 1858.

on Lieutenant Pointel, the chief of the staff of the Commandant on the African station, and the writer of the report which is impugned by the American and Liberian authorities. Moreover, the surgeon of the 'Regina Coeli' is favoured with a pension of 1800 francs.

There is yet another party to the case — ourselves. We have treaties, such as should prevent such a transaction as this with France, the United States, and Liberia. It is our business to see that no conspiracy takes place among our professing coadjutors, by which they carry on a slave-trade under false pretences. Those among our American kindred who are our genuine allies, will assist us (in the spirit of the paragraph we have quoted above) to ascertain the facts of every dubious case, and enforce the provisions of treaties with all the firmness that international good faith requires.

Before concluding our view of the American case, we must here give another illustration of what this French method of supplying negro labour to French colonies is like. We obtain it from our own colonial newspapers. Dominica is naturally the first to become acquainted with the real character of the 'immigration,' from its position between Martinique and Guadeloupe. It is to be hoped that its press will tell all that it knows, as the French colonial newspapers are not allowed to print anything on the subject. 'The Dominican' of June 16., we observe, offers its columns to anybody in Martinique who may wish to explain any transaction reported therein, as the 'Ouvre Mer' of St. Pierre had been 'silenced' by the government for having discussed the African emigration scheme.

On the 2d of last May, two negroes landed in Dominica from Martinique, in the capacity of escaped slaves. On the 15th of June, three more appeared alongside the 'Mayborough,' in Roseau roadstead, in a canoe, at three o'clock in the morning. One of these named Zaba (or, by the English off Cape Coast, Tom Dick), could speak English; and from him the history of all the five was obtained. Zaba had worked for Bristol and Liverpool vessels trading to Cape Coast for ivory and gold dust, the method being for the captains to make an agreement with the chief of the district, King Peter, for the services of a certain number of 'boys' for six months, at a certain rate of wages. These 'boys' always came home at the end of the term, with their money; so that no distrust existed when, at the close of 1856, a French captain applied for 'boys,' 'to work' 'same as they did for Englishmen, only they were to go further, 'would be paid good wages, and would be returned to their 'country at the end of six moons.' Forty 'boys' were engaged

on these terms, the captain writing their names in two books, one of which he gave to King Peter. The Africans supposed the books to contain the captain's 'word' that they should be paid as agreed, and returned at the end of six months. The first surprise was at the great number of 'boys' collected on board, and at their diversity of race and tribe, — there being no common language among the different groups. The next surprise (for there was nothing to complain of during the voyage), was their reception in Martinique. After a long 'palaver' between the captain and the governor, Zaba, and the four others who escaped to Dominica, and one more, who died, were delivered into a harsh slavery under the immediate control of a M. Jules, the overseer of a planter named Enou, whose estate of L'autre-bord lies on the windward side of the island. The thirty-four others were carried off in like manner, in different directions, and nothing more had been heard of them. M. Jules' victims were cruelly overworked, with scant food, many blows, and no pay. One of the party died from the effect of blows on the spine. This made the others eager to return home; but the attempt to claim their rights proved to them that they were 'niggers,' that is, slaves. At the end of the six months, there was no pay, nor move to send them home. After another half year, Zaba told M. Jules he must go back to his woman and his little boy, and that his five comrades wanted their wages and their liberty. The overseer's reply was that they were 'niggers,' and would never go back. The only hope now was in the high mountain which rose out of the sea on the horizon, — 'English-man's country,' as they were told. Two went off on the 1st of May; and at once precautions against further loss were taken on the estate, — the canoes secured every night, and great vigilance observed. Zaba heard, nevertheless, of the safety of the fugitives; and the rest of the party soon followed. Zaba spied out the place where the sail, oars, and paddle of a canoe were secreted; and, when he could not unlock the canoe from the beam to which it was chained, carried off beam and all. Once afloat, the three pushed off quietly to a good distance from the shore, then stepped the mast, and were safe. They needed assurance that they were so, however. When satisfied that they would not be delivered up, but might go to Liverpool, on their way home, as soon as they had earned enough to pay their passage, they were overjoyed. The district from which these poor fellows were carried off was near the French settlement of Grand Bassin, on the Cape Coast. Hence the French captain's knowledge of the English method of hiring labourers; and hence the negroes' knowledge of M. Jules' lan-

guage. As for the rest, they prefer the English as employers, because 'the English have only one mouth' everywhere, whereas the French have two; a pleasant ('sugar') one in Africa, and a less agreeable one in Martinique. Moreover, the 'Englishman 'Queen' has put a letter into the hands of all kings, to say that the black men are not to be made niggers any more. This faith in the great letter and the 'one mouth' must be justified, any amount of diplomatic correspondence and clamorous rage, and double-tongued intrigue notwithstanding.

The briefest possible statement of the facts of American legislation, in connexion with slavery, will suffice here, both because those facts are notorious, and because it is more to our purpose to mark the temper which underlies the facts; but some reference to leading acts of Congress is indispensable to the completeness of the case.

The point on which the policy of the Republic has turned, since it involved the anomaly of slavery, is the equal representation of States in the Senate. A majority in the Senate was the same thing as preponderance in the Federal Government; and the faster the free States advanced in population, and in the consequent importance in the House of Representatives, the more essential it was to the Southern section to multiply States below the slave line, and to push up the slave line so as to include more States. Hence the controversies and struggles about Missouri, and the revolutionary abrogation of the old provision, made by the founders of the Republic, for the eternal exclusion of slavery from the new lands north-west of the Ohio. Hence the adoption of a policy corresponding with the Russian, in regard to neighbouring countries: the policy of first introducing harmless cultivators of the soil; sending after them a more stirring order of rovers, who generated discontents among the inhabitants, offered their aid in the struggle they had provoked, made themselves arbiters or protectors, and at length conquerors and masters. Such was the process in the Texas case, with the aggravation that slavery was introduced and re-established where it had been successfully abolished. The story is more painful than it is generally known to be. The first settlers were more innocent, and the next batch more guilty, than is commonly supposed. The experience of two or three English travellers is enough to illustrate the scheme. An English clergyman, who took his wife down the Mississippi to die of consumption, was ensnared by the pretences of the schemers, who took him on the weak side of his benevolence, and not only engaged him to frame a constitution which should

be a model of a Christian democracy, but employed him as a decoy to bring in other Britishers, who might induce their Government to sanction emigration to Texas, or to appear to countenance American proceedings there. Carefully concealing the fact of their leader being then in a Mexican prison, and that there was no prospect of the territory being granted to them, they made great offers of land to English travellers of any importance, in return for their counsel in making the new constitution, and for their residence for a term of years. The first inquiry of the English, in such cases, was about the intention in regard to slavery. 'Oh, there was to be no slavery.' Slavery was to be prohibited by the constitution.' Closer inquiry brought out the explanation. There were to be plenty of negroes; but they were all to be 'apprentices for 99 years.' There were to be no slaves; only apprentices. But even this profession was not true. An extensive slave-trade was carried on at that very time. Companies of slaves were landed at night, from Louisiana, on a spit of sand near Galveston; and the importation from Cuba was even then considerable. The clergyman died ignorant of the frauds which had been practised upon him;—ignorant of the promulgation of a 'scrip' which represented nothing; of the conspiracies going on in Mexico, and the recruiting in the United States, and the fraud and violence which resulted in the Mexican war, and the annexation of the territory which he trusted was to be a model republic. A fever carried him off the first season, and left his children orphans. The object of his tempters was twofold;—to obtain a territory which would cut up into several States,—five or more, giving to the South ten or more new seats in the Senate; and to open a virgin soil to planters and their slaves, who were fast going down into debt and destitution on the exhausted lands of the old States. Hence the subsequent conflict in regard to the North-western lands beyond the Ohio, which the free States hoped to divide, in like manner, so as to keep up their equality in the Senate. We need not detail the well-known facts of the struggle: the abrogation of the security of the North-western area from slavery; the imposition of the Fugitive Slave Law; the extension of pro-slavery law over the whole Union; and finally the DRED SCOTT decision, by which it is declared of four millions of the inhabitants of the Republic that 'the black man has no rights which the white man is bound to respect.' This is enough to say of the federal legislation of the Republic.

A quarter of a century ago, the Abolitionists, then a new sect, were petitioning Congress for the extinction of slavery in

the Congressional District (of ten miles square) in which Washington stands; the object being to remove the institution from its federal lodgment, and render it a concern of the separate States. The immediate effect was, that the right of petition was suspended. The scandal was so great, that, on the one hand, many eyes were opened to the vital character of the difficulty, and, on the other, the subject was pronounced by the Southern members of Congress, 'got rid of for ever' at Washington. This was seen by many to be 'the beginning of the 'end;' and the conflict has proceeded with great activity ever since. In ten years, the Capitol resounded with complaints that, whatever subject was introduced in either House, it always merged in that of slavery; and this was simply a type of the politics of the whole country. The South was always predominant at Washington, and always conscious that its tether was a shortening one; and therefore the South was encroaching, insolent, degenerate in constitutionalism, and insufferable in manners. The Northern men declined in public spirit and republican courage, and showed more and more of the lower sort of mercantile *animus*, while becoming more and more prone to reckless speculation, and to an aggressive foreign policy which might postpone the settlement of troubles at home. It began to be said of the Americans that they had made a mistake in supposing Washington to be the type of their national character; that it had been more like Franklin, but that the nearest resemblance would be found in the worst side of Jefferson's reputation, as his enemies would describe it. Is the world to be afflicted with the spectacle of a further decline?—of Paul Jones being the model founder of the Republic? To arrest the deterioration, the slave-trade must be dealt with speedily and resolutely.

The nation was becoming partially wealthy, but it was growing very sick. It lost the use of its great men. The noble race of Presidents came to an end when a tool of the South was required for the post. No great man commanded suffrages by his merits; and any great man who coveted the post was certain to lose his merits—happily in vain. Webster bowed his splendid head to the yoke of the South, and died broken-hearted at the consequences of the humiliation. Clay sustained repeated disappointments, and left a tainted reputation, as having been the obstacle to the restriction and reduction of slavery in some of the frontier States, and the cause of its establishment in Missouri, Florida, and Arkansas. Calhoun died broken-hearted also;—not on account of any forfeiture of political honour, for he was courageous and consistent as a public man;

but because he saw, as he declared on his death-bed, that the interior slave-trade and the Union were incompatible, and that slavery must go down in the struggle. His theory was, that 'slavery was the corner-stone of republican liberties,' meaning by this the oligarchical privileges of South Carolina; and the extinction of slavery, which he saw to be inevitable, was, in his eyes, equivalent to the downfall of his 'gallant little South Carolina.' 'As it is impossible to suppose that the politicians who have ruled the Republic for the last dozen years can be the best statesmen the country can produce, the conclusion is inevitable, that the sectional conflict has delivered over the State to the management of an inferior and perpetually declining order of men; while it is, at the same time, too clear, that the average character of the American people has sunk far below its traditional reputation. Instead of the cultivated aristocracy of the old slave States, who exemplified for the moment the ordinary plea for an oligarchical system—the benefit of a lettered class blessed with leisure—we now see a race of bullies, ignorant of books and of life, and unskilled in all gentle arts and highbred manners. This is immediately owing to the presence of slavery, not only from the immorality and coarseness which grow out of the institution, but from the necessary restriction of the press, and discouragement of liberal thought and speech. There is scarcely a good book in any language which can now be admitted freely and without emasculation in the slave States (hence our difficulty in obtaining an international copyright law); and when we add, that a Commission is now sitting to prepare a literature suitable to the institutions of the Southern States, the case will be found sufficiently plain. A complete series of school and university books is to be prepared, because the planters will no longer send their sons north for education, nor admit the received morality and political history of the world into their own circle. Yet their schools and colleges languish, and the aristocracy of the South presents a spectacle of intellectual barbarism as wonderful as it is painful. The much larger class of non-slaveholding whites is, generally speaking, totally ignorant. We need not describe the class, now sufficiently well known through Mrs. Stowe's novels, the descriptions of recent travellers, Mr. Helper's book on 'the Impending Crisis of the South,' and the war in Kansas, where the 'ruffian' class consisted of these people, sent thither by the planters, to fight for the extension of slavery. Some of them, who learned to resent such treatment as plying them with drink and bombast, putting arms and bibles in their hands, and sending them to propagate the institution which had ruined them,

soon settled down on the new soil, and are experiencing the blessings of industry in a free atmosphere; and these may yet stimulate their class in the South to that 'rebellion' through the ballot-boxes which their slave-holding neighbours supremely dread, and which explains much of their recent action. We need say nothing of the exhausted estates, of the poverty, so ostentatiously deplored in Southern Conventions every year; the hopeless mortgages, the crumbling mansions, the fruitless attempts to raise capital for shipping, roads, and public institutions; and the jealousy of the North, by whose capital and industry the machinery of society goes on. We need only refer to all local newspapers for testimony of the depravation of manners which shows itself by the evidence of personal violence. We will add only two remarks. First, we repeat (and shall be forgiven for doing so), the scarcely credible numbers given by the Census and other local accounts of the population—that the entire slaveholding class is under 350,000 in a total population of 27,000,000; and that in the Slave States themselves, the slaveholding class amounts to no more than three-tenths of the *white* population. Next, we must recall to the reader's memory, that the immunity from insurrection which the South has enjoyed ever since the existence of the Abolitionists became known throughout the negro population, has been broken up by the Southern politicians themselves. By their own account, they made speeches two years ago, within earshot of negro listeners, by which the slaves learned that the first consequence of Fremont's success would be the abolition of slavery. We shall see presently the bearing of these facts on the African slave-trade, and on some highly important interests of our own.

The North has not declined so thoroughly and universally as the South, but there are sad tales to tell there also. The old industry and its pleasant results have gradually merged in a rapacity, sharp dealing, and ostentation of wealth which would never have distinguished such a race as peopled the northern States if there had not been an uneasy consciousness of a radical mischief, impelling towards intoxication of the mind in business or pleasure. In all the great ports it has always been known that the slave-trade was largely participated in by American citizens, both at home and abroad. The inter-state slave-trade has usually been carried on by northern speculators; and merchants of reputation and wealth in New York, Baltimore, and even Boston, could tell, quite as well as their acquaintance in Virginia, what has become of the scores of thousands of slaves over and above those acknowledged as received in the importing States. They could tell us a good deal of the amount of

American capital invested in the traffic on the African coast. Much of the deterioration in the commercial spirit in the Northern States may be ascribed to this clandestine practice, and much also to the corrupting effect of a close mercantile connexion with the South. But, on the other hand, symptoms are not wanting of increasing public spirit and increasing means to meet the crisis. The practical failure of the Southern policy in regard to **Kansas** arrests the advance of slavery to the North-west, and the progress of free labour in the cultivation of cotton and other commodities begins to be felt in the older States.

Virginia leads the frontier States, which will necessarily all act together. As an exhausted country, with little other connexion with slavery than by the business of slave-breeding, Virginia is now a telegraph of public opinion in regard to slave-trade questions. Alarmed at the propositions made by conventions and legislatures at the South to re-open the African slave-trade, the old State has made some strong demonstrations. One party, it is true, has sentenced a merchant captain to forty years in the penitentiary for giving a passage to five fugitive slaves, and has procured from the legislature a prohibition to emancipate slaves by will; but these are acts which show by their excess their insecure character. Nobody believes that Captain Baylis will wear out his forty years; and more negroes are emancipated at once as a consequence of the prohibition to do it by testamentary process. On the other hand, free labourers are encouraged to enter the State, and form settlements on lapsed plantations; the upland farmers west of the mountains are resolved on a plan of gradual emancipation, well-intended though impracticable; the State is becoming rapidly drained of slaves, and the political leaders of Old Virginia are strenuously opposing every attempt to revive the slave-trade in any form or degree whatever. At the Southern Convention, held this year at Montgomery, Alabama, Mr. Pryor, editor of a leading Virginia newspaper, threw his whole weight into opposition to the report of the committee recommending the re-opening of the African slave-trade. Mr. Pryor treated the proposal as tantamount to a declaration of secession from the Union; and, assuming this, he avowed, in his representative capacity, a determination not to secede from the Union 'but with an undivided South.' The same resolution was expressed in another form by the other leading Virginia newspaper, the '*Richmond Enquirer*,' when commenting on the discussion at Montgomery. The people of Virginia were asked whether, in case of an introduction of the slave-trade, which must break up the Union, they would not rather ally themselves with the North than with the slave States,

which, as Mr. Pryor had said, would rest under the reprobation of present and future generations, for an act so repugnant to 'Southern chivalry' as relapsing into the slave-trade? The reasons as signed by the 'Enquirer' are not very 'chivalrous,' and they may be all the more cogent.

'In the Northern Confederacy, Virginia would derive a large amount from the sale of her slaves to the South, and again in the increased value of her lands from northern immigration—while, in the Southern Confederacy, with the African slave-trade revived, she would lose two-thirds of the value of her slave property, and derive no additional increase to the value of her lands.'

With Virginia, Maryland and Delaware, Kentucky and Missouri, would probably join the Northern federation. The two former are scarcely slave States now, so impossible is it to keep possession of slaves on the frontier, while difficulties are incessantly arising from the passage of fugitives on the one hand, and the aggressions of kidnappers on the other. The abduction of free persons, and especially of children, white as well as coloured, is becoming an evil which renders frontier life intolerable. Mr. William Chambers tells us, in his recent work on 'American Slavery and Colour' (p. 3.), that 'the practice of kidnapping white children in the Northern States, and transferring them southward, is said to be notoriously on the increase. We see it mentioned that, in the city of New York alone, as many as thirty children, on an average, are stolen yearly; it being shrewdly guessed that many of them are carried to the markets of the South, where a good price for them can be readily obtained.' No State in the Union can long submit to be made the scene of a slave-trade of this kind, or can be permitted to allow it; and in such a case, a junction with the free States must be close at hand.

Not less significant are the various proposals in regard to negro labourers made since the beginning of the current presidential term, which assumes to be a period of calm and of truce! Various legislatures have discussed schemes for enabling free negroes to sell themselves into slavery for terms of years, or for life; or for prohibiting emancipation by will or otherwise; or for permitting the immigration of indentured negroes, or coolies from India or China; or for openly reviving the old slave-trade. Every annual Convention debates the subject. That at Knoxville last year assigned to a committee the work of preparing the report which elicited the remonstrances of Virginia; and that report, presented on the 10th of last May, is one of the strangest productions of our century. No ingenuity and no eloquence avail, however, to obtain acceptance for any of these schemes.

All have been put down at once which bear any resemblance to a slave-trade. It is a case in which the North rules, with the aid of the slave-breeding States,—principle and interest, the spirit and the flesh, God and Mammon, being for the occasion brought into harmony. ‘No proposition to revive the slave-trade will ever be listened to by the United States,’ says everybody who speaks with authority; and before this declaration, Far-west legislatures and sectional conventions have only to hold their peace. These are also critical symptoms.

This survey of American conditions and symptoms exhibits the operation of the most fatal of institutions on the most flourishing of republics. We need not describe more of the indications of the malady which has already disorganised the most promising social condition in the world. All great men sunk beneath the surface; liberty of speech and of the press everywhere more or less restricted; the churches discredited, divided and enfeebled; the social temper soured and exasperated; the manners of the North rendered artificial or suspicious, and those of the South depraved beyond retrieval, and the two great sections of the Union alienated by a hatred unparalleled (as far as we know) in intensity and in violence of expression by any international hostility on record; a too inflated wealth in one section, a too ruinous poverty in the other; secret pangs of conscience among northern mammon worshippers, and suppressed groans and curses among southern victims of that mammon worship;—these are some of the consequences of that fatal original compromise which buried an explosive anomaly in the foundations of a fair-seeming structure of liberty. So much for the domestic results.

The foreign policy generated by the same cause is no less disastrous. Few words will suffice here. All the world recognises the internal uneasiness which makes every American cabinet and congress quarrelsome and rude, and dependent thus on the forbearance and good manners of other governments. It is abundantly evident that the Washington Government picks quarrels abroad, in proportion to its stress at home; and the stress at home is always from the slavery question, in one form or another. Again, the bickering character of American political intercourse is deeply implicated with a consciousness of incapacity for war, for genuine sustained warfare, which is also ascribable to slavery. Wherever slavery and labour, slavery and subordination, are connected, labour and subordination become impossible to any but slaves. While southern writers and other citizens regard the northern yeomanry and traders as ‘niggers,’ because they labour, the ‘mean whites’ of the South, who ought to be its yeomanry and traders, will not labour, nor

the soldiers of those States obey, lest they should be regarded as slaves. The Mexican war showed how impossible military discipline is in a United States' army; and every long voyage, almost every trip of a merchant vessel, exhibits the existence of that tyranny which is substituted when subordination fails. This consciousness explains a good deal of American discourtesy and touchiness; and it should operate on other Powers in preparing them for a new method of warfare, if peace with the United States could not be maintained.

The aggressive policy which tends to annexation of new territory is too well understood to need more than a reference. Entered upon to procure new land, when slavery was exhausting the conditions of capital and labour, this system of encroachment may not necessarily expire with the institution which generated it. We have seen that slavery is now headed round at almost every outlet: but it does not follow that the passions and desires which have sprung from it will so subside as to render the American Union a safe and genial neighbour. Add to this the conscious decline of character and of reputation in the world, lately much accelerated, and the fatal certainty with which the worst governments connive with the American, to make a tool of it, or to hide behind it, while the best find it more and more difficult and distasteful to transact business with it, and the circle of calamities seems to be complete. Truly Washington had reason to doubt, when pacing the bank of the Schuylkill, whether the constitution which should unite the States in subjection to a fatal anomaly could be better for them than waiting upon events.

No consideration, however, is more plain than that of the high merit and hopeful greatness of the genuine republicans throughout the Union. There are true-hearted citizens scattered everywhere; and the body of the people in the free States are probably sound. The blusterers, who undertake to speak for the nation, are no representatives of anybody or of anything but the abuses of the State. How the women of the South are disposed towards slavery, may be understood by its influence on domestic morals. Slavery will not be preserved by the wives and mothers of southern society. The millions of non-slaveholding whites would abolish it at the first election, if they were not sequestered from books, news, and companionship as they are, partly by the policy of the superior class, and partly by their own depression of mind and fortunes. Elsewhere, the multitudes who can and who will rescue their country from its curse have been kept quiet by an idolatrous worship of the Union, and by an infinity of connexions with the South.

Whenever the necessity of a decision for or against the institution is at hand, there can be no doubt what it will be. There are a few political men, and there are many moral and social leaders who will bring up to the front the mighty force of sound opinion which at present terrifies the slave power by the warnings it utters from its retreats. The Republic has suffered in every way. Let us hope that it has suffered enough. The true way out of the mischief and misery is now provided. A faithful alliance with England in carrying out the provisions of anti-slave-trade treaties is the first step. This taken, the institution of slavery must die out, and within a short date.

It is quite natural that so critical a season should be eagerly made use of by the lovers of power and pelf for a last attempt to shake off the restraints of treaties, and to reopen the African slave-trade. Reasonable men must always have known that this would be the way in which the old practice would expire. Some one or two countries would be the last in which slavery would exist in a manner requiring replenishment: when the day came for abolishing slavery there (as a national institution), there must inevitably be a conflict between the slaveholders and the reformers; and the opportunity of the strife would be seized by all piratically-disposed parties to drive a great trade while they could, so as, perhaps, to intimidate England, and dishearten its government and people with the prospect of losing the results of a struggle of half a century. This is precisely what is happening now. Mackintosh's prophecy about the future use of Wilberforce's example becomes apt and cheering. The duty of all parties who care for duty is just what our fathers would have laid down as such, in contemplation of the crisis we have reached. Our duty is to hold to our purpose, and prosecute it with more vigour than ever, rallying to the cause all good allies, and gaining over by prudence and energy all who may be vacillating. As to audacious violators of treaties, and treacherous allies, who cover over perjury with cant, England knows very well how to deal with them. She has authority to overawe the one class, and energy and coolness to spoil the game of the other. The occasion is grave enough, and of sufficient interest. Twenty years ago, when we had spent 15,000,000*l.* in suppressing the trade alone, besides the sacrifices to procure emancipation in our own colonies, we were full of heart and hope, though slavery existed in such vigour, in so many lands, that the prospect of the extinction of the traffic was obscure and remote. Now, when our sacrifices have been increased, while the slave-trade has sunk to a very manageable amount, through the reduction of the area of slavery, we shall hardly relax in our efforts on

account of a temporary flutter in cabinets, and hubbub in the Cuban waters,—designed to alarm us with fears of war, and to conceal from us our real command over the whole case.

The United States and Cuba keep up the slave-trade. If Cuba were alone, such an obstacle would be quickly disposed of, for Spain could not withstand the pressure—‘the moral blockade,’ as Mr. Sumner calls it,—of the whole civilised world. Of all the remonstrants, the Americans would, in that case, be the most vigorous; partly because converts are zealous, and partly through jealousy of what is erroneously considered cheap labour in a rival country. This is just the state of things which may be near at hand, and which may be peaceably accomplished, if England and her true allies are faithful to their duty. We hear a great deal of one side of the question, and nothing of the other, in regard to the American desire for the annexation of Cuba. The existing President is best known in Europe by his part in the Ostend Manifesto: and he has been expected to annex Cuba, from the day of his entrance upon office. No doubt, he intended to win fame from future generations for that act: but the thing is not done yet; and an increasing number of his countrymen are determined that it shall not be done:—that is, not done by him, nor for his purposes. It is not only the virtue of the country that is enlisted against the project. In the sugar-growing districts of the United States, there is a strong repugnance to the acquisition of Cuba, the planters seeing that they must either migrate to Cuba, or leave off producing sugar. There is a wide impression throughout the slave States that their fortunes would sink yet lower if their impoverished estates were brought into direct comparison with those of Cuba. Many of the citizens appear to believe what they tell others,—that the annexation of Cuba would be followed by that of Canada, where 60,000 free negroes are living near the frontier, and would be recoverable as fugitives from the South; and for the sake of this consideration,—(so wild in our view!) they advocate the purchase of Cuba, which they would not otherwise consider desirable. Of the nature of the northern objections we need not say much. For a counterpoise to the morbid excitability, vanity, and cupidity of the filibustering element of society, there is the old virtue of honesty which has come down from ‘forefathers’ days;’ the patriotism which dreads the deterioration of national character by perpetual acquisition and roving; and an apprehension of having to balance Cuba in the Senate by disturbing the northern frontier again. On the whole, however, public opinion is much less united,

less definite, less ascertained on this subject than the speechifiers on 'manifest destiny' would have us believe.

In 1840, and perhaps even five years later, 135,000 negroes were annually exported from Africa; whereas only 15,000 have been obtained for Cuba (the only market) within the last three years.* The trade to Brazil is extinguished. In former days, there were three Powers notoriously difficult to deal with in regard to their anti-slave-trade treaties,—Spain, Portugal, and the United States. Now Portugal is acting faithfully and vigorously on the right side. From the peace of 1815, abundant legal provision was made for stigmatising and punishing violations of the treaty entered into with England; but practically the traffic did not cease. The profession was good; but the practice was nought, as is now the case with Spain,—and not with Spain alone. In 1847, however, the Portuguese Government compelled the destruction of certain slave-barracoons which existed on the Angola coast, and by subsequent acts controlled the mischievous petty kings within the colonial area of Portugal. In 1855, regulations on behalf of colonial slaves were confirmed, and provision was made for their redemption. Thenceforward, the chief colonial ports were freely opened to foreign commerce, which must drive out traffic in slaves; and when Ambriz, on the Congo coast, was thus opened, slavery was declared to be abolished there. In April last, a decree was published which ordained the total abolition of slavery throughout the colonial dominions of Portugal within twenty years. Experienced observers understand that such terms of preparation answer as ill in the case of emancipation as in that of the removal of an impost; and they therefore expect to see all Portuguese slaves freed long before the lapse of twenty years. Meantime, our old ally is faithfully assisting us in the task of naval watch. Besides the small-armed craft employed on colonial objects, there are ships of war,—at present three, and often more,—guarding the African coast, with our cruisers.

Spain has always been the very worst Power to deal with of the whole group of sovereign States. At the Peace, King Ferdinand had the same sensibilities as the other Christian monarchs, and expressed them very solemnly; but it needed a bribe of 400,000*l.* three years afterwards to induce him to take any steps at all towards the fulfilment of his promises. Then

* It is feared, however, that since the withdrawal of the British squadron from the Western waters a considerable increase has taken place, and that from 20,000 to 30,000 negroes have been conveyed to Cuba this year under the American flag.

ensued a long series of evasions, followed by decrees which were not obeyed, — disputed, or said to be disputed, in Cuba, and found at last to have been never heard of there. During the nine years ending in 1832, 236 vessels imported 100,000 slaves into Cuba, while eighty-nine other vessels, from Havanna, were captured by our cruisers, or perished with their cargoes of negroes. Lord Clarendon obtained a treaty in 1836, when he was at Madrid, by which vessels equipped for the traffic were made seizable, the officers punishable, the vessels liable to condemnation, and the negroes committed to the care of the British Government. In a trice, nineteen captured vessels, Spanish, were carried into Sierra Leone for adjudication; whereas six in a year was the former average. This was the immediate result of the working of the treaty being lodged in British, instead of Spanish, hands. We hoped then that the Spanish slave-trade had received its death-blow. It is certainly a vast gain that the importation has been so considerably reduced; but we must not relax in vigilance and energy while Spain employs American ships in procuring slaves for Cuba; and while official personages in the colony, and in the capital, and royal personages in the courts of allies, as well as at Madrid, accept a rich revenue from a trade which is publicly admitted to be abominable in the eyes of all Christian people. As long as we allow such a violation of treaty-obligations, we shall be subject to painful remonstrances from the sound republicans of the United States, who declare that the redemption of their own country is delayed by nothing so much as by that state of things in Cuba which Great Britain holds the power of putting an end to. If we could induce Spain to emancipate the slaves in Cuba, — which is the desire of a large proportion of residents, — there would be an end, say these Americans, of the Slave-trade; of the expense of guarding against it, of disputes with other Powers as to the conduct of our cruisers; of buccaneering expeditions from the United States; of threats from Washington of war with Spain; of the overbearing predominance of the slave-power in the Federal Government; and, finally, of slavery itself in the United States. Such are the representations of the best men in the Republic; and very earnest is the request they urge that we will use our treaty relations with Spain to the utmost, to induce this change of policy, while that of the American Republic is trembling in the balance.

What does the American slave-trade on behalf of Cuba amount to? When other nations have withdrawn from the traffic, leaving it almost exclusively to the United States and Spain, and when we know how many negroes are imported into

Cuba; we have only to divide the amount between Spain and the United States. Our readers have probably seen the correspondence between the British and American Ministers, Mr. Crampton, Lord Napier, and Mr. Cass, on this subject, presented to Congress on the 21st of April last, and thence promulgated in the newspapers. American readers were astonished at the disclosure of the extent to which their ships have been and are employed in the traffic *; while European readers could hardly be less amazed at the tone of rebuke with which English 'fanaticism' is treated by Mr. Mason, at Paris, and Mr. Cass, at Washington. This correspondence, however, discloses less than the remarkable series of letters, signed 'Sigma,' which have appeared in the 'Boston Evening Transcript,' from May to the present time.

These letters are avowedly written for the purpose of acquainting the general public with facts of which they have had no conception — in the confident expectation that public opinion will compel the Government at Washington to enter seriously on the task of extinguishing the foreign slave-trade, in conjunction with England and her allies. We read of vessels by the dozen chased by cruisers, obliged to yield, or to run ashore, for the chance of the crew's escape, or watched under suspicion, while carrying the American flag, and sometimes escaping, but occasionally caught in the act of embarking or discharging their cargoes. There is a group of seven, gravely suspected, and consigned to firms in New York, connected with the slave-trade; and another group of four, understood to belong to New Orleans; and yet another group of four, captured with cargoes of negroes, bound for the south coast of Cuba. These facts,

* Among the despatches is a letter from Lord Napier to Mr. Cass, detailing the following facts:—In the early months of 1857, ten vessels were captured, of which eight, carrying the American flag, were condemned as slavers. The two others—the 'General Pierce' and the 'Splendid'—were captured by Portuguese men-of-war; the 'Splendid' being fitted for the stowage of 1000 slaves. Nineteen others, all Americans, follow on the list, one of which, the 'North Hand,' was chartered by the notorious house of Figanieri, Reis & Co. of New York, for the ostensible purpose of conveying food to the starving inhabitants of the Cape de Verde islands! The recent capture of the 'Echo,' with 384 slaves on board, by an American cruiser, is an encouraging indication of the effects produced by these disclosures; but the punishment of the slaver-captain is still uncertain, and the project for consigning these negroes to the agents of the Colonisation Society in Liberia deserves the liveliest reprobation.

accompanied by the names of the vessels, and of their owners, are, we trust, sufficient to rouse the same deep abhorrence of the slave-trade throughout the free Northern States, which prevailed when the trade was made piracy by law, in 1808, before any other country had gone so far. Relying on the disposition of the American people to protect the honour of their flag from the outrages of piracy, under whatsoever form the British Government have explicitly renounced (what, indeed, they never claimed or possessed), the right of searching in time of peace the merchant vessels of any foreign Power; for as we never had the right of enforcing the municipal laws of any other country, it is admitted that an American slaver *in flagranti delictu* might sail with impunity through a fleet of our cruisers. But in endeavouring to establish the common interest of the civilised world to put down piracy and slave-trade, we have asked for nothing which we have not granted to others, and these powers have been as freely exercised by American cruisers over British ships as over American ships by British cruisers. Some such protection we hold to be indispensable to the safety of the high seas. Were it altogether withdrawn, the banks of the Bahamas and the entrance to the Gulf would again be infested with sea-rovers, and in their anxiety to escape from the vigilance of the British squadron, the Americans have contracted a peremptory obligation to provide for the safety of navigation and the execution of their own laws conjointly with our own authorities in those seas.

At the moment when these disclosures are taking the quiet citizens of the Union by surprise, they are also learning that the 'British outrages' of last spring are, for the most part, imaginary. The coasting skippers of the slave States got home first, and told their story with a tropical luxuriance of fancy. The cool New England captains entered their ports later, and rectified the tale. On the whole, we are not disposed to regret the occurrence of the troubles in the Gulf and in the Cabinets. They testify to the critical state of American opinion on the subject, and to the shifts to which the trade is put. They have brought out the fact that our presence in the Cuban waters was owing to the solicitation of the American Government. They compel a clear understanding of what method of observation is to be adopted by all parties to the treaties against the slave-trade. Yet more, they have resulted in casting upon the Washington Government the responsibility of guarding the American flag from abuse. The very first move was the highly favourable one of the President and his cabinet requesting the co-operation of our govern-

ment in devising a plan for the effectual prevention of the slave-trade, in regard to the ships of the two nations.* The people of both countries are awaiting with eagerness the announcement of the methods which shall be agreed upon. At the same time, we have the promise of Ministers that all means shall be adopted to induce Spain to observe her obligations: and, if the United States co-operate with us in sincerity, there can be no rational doubt of the possibility of compelling Spain to observe her own terms in a matter which concerns the whole civilised world.

This is the moment chosen by the French colonial planters, and their ruler at home, for discomposing the whole train of circumstances, and throwing back the entire policy, by reviving the African slave-trade on their own account. At the outset of our remarks, we called it a disguised slave-trade that the French Emperor had instituted: but, from evidence which has since arrived in abundance, we must now call it an undisguised traffic of the kind condemned, a quarter of a century ago, by all the Powers of the civilised world. It is enough to say here that we are aware of what is doing, and of what is planned. We shall keep attention fixed on French agents and their doings round the whole circuit of Africa, — emphatically including Algeria: and when a long array of evidence becomes as patent as that which we are now obtaining about the transactions in Liberia, the world will decide between the negro race and an emperor, who, with all his meditateness of character, seems to forget that he is living in the nineteenth century, and among nations who have risen to a capacity of having principles and a policy. A man of any amount of ability may easily wreck himself upon a rock so reared by time from the depths; but he can no more overthrow our principle and our policy in regard to the negro races than he can pluck up our islands by the roots, and float them as rafts for his convenience on the high seas. His new policy is a troublesome and vexatious accident. It is not only a burden and an interruption in itself, but it acts unfavourably on the evil-minded in all directions. It is the cause and occasion of that wonderful mistake between Mr. Mason and Count Walewski which has been so thoroughly canvassed, and so completely detected in America, — the false declaration that England would not object

* In answer to remonstrances from Southern Conventions, which represented the American squadron on the African coast as an insult to the South, Mr. Tyler, the Ex-President, lately claimed as his own the pledge that the American Government should station a naval armament of eighty guns in the African waters, to enforce the laws and protect the flag of the Republic.

to this French slave-trade while the Coolie importation into our colonies went on. It is the impulse which has quickened the slave-trade into new life along hundreds of miles of African coast. It has caused a British consul to be insulted and stoned in even a Portuguese colony, by renewing the hopes of sordid traders 'of the viler sort.' It has brought out the bad side of human nature wherever it has been broached: and the same method of rule keeps the right mind of France ignorant of the facts of the case. But all these misfortunes affect merely the question of time, in regard to the extinction of the slave-trade. The same influences which procured its condemnation first, and its reduction afterwards to its present dimensions, exist in all their original force, and others are added. The trade is as wicked as ever it was, and it is known and felt to be so by a much greater number of persons, of greater experience than our fathers could have possessed when they gained their victory. Since their day a new order of considerations, of unsurpassed significance, has risen up.

The aspect of Africa and its people to European eyes is wholly changed within one generation. The world at large knows Africa better; and Africa is the better for knowing the rest of the world. Perhaps the report of the American Southern Convention for this year presents as fair an account of negro-life, as our fathers regarded it, as could now be obtained. In that report, we meet with quotations from books of travel of various date, including Barth's and Livingstone's,—the extracts being throughout those which describe the worst barbarisms of the most barbarous tribes. These are offered by the American committee as evidence of the incapacity of the negro for social organisation, no notice being taken of any changes which occur in consequence of intercourse with more advanced races. Thus did negro nations appear to Europeans half a century ago. For many years our estimate of the native African has been changing; and now the time has come when argument without premisses is seen to be absurd, and we point to the facts of what negro communities *can do*, instead of speculating at random on what they *must be*. The merest glance at accounts of our imports from Africa will show how the suppression of the slave-trade has operated in developing industry and commerce among as primitive a society as can be found in the world.

When living in peace and quiet, the natives bring down palm oil to the markets in earthen pots which they carry on their heads. This one product now sells for above 2,000,000*l.* a year. The French prefer the oil from ground nuts, of which they can consume any quantity, and this is fortunate, because the cultivation

of the ground nut is a step in advance of collecting palm oil. The produce increases rapidly; and to it we now find added an oil from cucumber seeds, on which a good deal of labour is spent, and an assortment of dyes about which the natives have a secret. Cotton culture seems to be spreading all over the country; for travellers who enter it in any direction report of more or less of it in the interior. The exportation of cotton cloths from the west coast has long been considerable; but, as British manufactures penetrate the interior, it becomes more profitable to the natives to exchange their raw cotton for our woven fabrics. The fact that 1250 bales were produced in 1857 for consignment to one trader at Manchester, Mr. Clegg, is enough to show what may be expected if this progressive branch of industry is not destroyed by the introduction of slave-trading. Young natives have been trained in England, and have established the cleaning and dressing of cotton at home; the quantity and quality are improving every year; the purchase of commodities from abroad is becoming a great benefit and delight to the people; and the idea is intolerable that strangers should come and throw everything into chaos again, on the canting plea that it is for the good of Africa to take away the people and make them work elsewhere. All the way up the frequented rivers, and in many regions of the interior, the people are now picking cotton, and travelling to and fro with it, and with what they get in exchange: their faculties are developed; their hearts are gayer; their habits are purer; their homes are safer; and when all is going well.—when the prospect opens of a variety of other crops being raised, indigo, grain, spices, roots, rice, and fruits, besides a large business in timber, beeswax, gums, dyes, feathers and hides,—the emissaries of M. Regis, or of Spanish traders on the coast, or of firms at New York or Baltimore, burst in upon the scene, and bring back a legion of the devils which had been exorcised with so much pains.* Dr. Barth has

* We are indebted to the Bishop of Oxford for the perusal of a letter of considerable importance which he has received from Dr. Livingstone, dated 22nd June, on board the 'Pearl' steamer, in the Zambesi, on the east coast of Africa. Any such letter to one bearing the revered name of Wilberforce, must be interesting; but there are material statements of fact in it which lend an additional value to this communication. Of these facts, the one most worthy of attention is the travellers having found, on the banks of the river Luare, which they ascended some seventy miles, very fine cotton in the gardens of the natives; the flat fertile land, being within the influence of the sea-air, yields the plant almost without cultivation. These lands are supposed by Dr. Livingstone to be suited to the produc-

told us what happens when a stimulus is given to the expiring slave traffic of the interior. He has shown us the desolate villages and the plundered towns; the gangs of captives; the victims not wanted for slaves who are left on the ground bleeding to death,—a leg or arm having been cut off for that purpose. On being applied to, in regard to affording supplies of free labourers for the colonies, for a term of years, African potentates all make pretty much the same answer. The letter from the king of Calabar, which Lord Brougham read in the House of Lords, may serve for the whole order. The people will not go if asked, says the King of Calabar: if they went, they would not be expected back, but, ‘King Archibury and all Calabar gentlemen all be very glad to do the same;—we shall buy them asam we do that time slave tradebin. . . We have all agreed to charges four boxes of brass and copper rod for man, woman and children, but shall not be able to supply quantity you mention. I think we shall be able to get four or five hundred for one vessel,’ &c.

Let the King of Calabar’s words have their due weight with other sovereigns when he writes, ‘Regard to free emigration we man no will go for himself.’ Why should they go, when at home there is food enough for all, and society has just entered on that stage when industry and its blessings are beginning

tion of the celebrated Sea-Island cotton of the United States, the finest of any. The other fact of importance is, that the Slave-trade, to use the Doctor’s expression, ‘is eating out the Portuguese power’ in these parts. The Portuguese authorities at Tete and other points on the river who received Dr. Livingstone with so much kindness on his former journey, ‘have been expelled by the natives from every station,’ said those with whom the travellers had communication. ‘This,’ says Dr. Livingstone, ‘is the consequence of the Portuguese entering cordially into the notorious French Emigration scheme.’ The commandant of Tete stated in a letter that he had been a prisoner at Kilimane for the last six months, from a fear of passing between Mazaro and Senna. When we met the people of Mazaro, about two hundred were well armed, and ready to fight us, on the supposition that we were Portuguese; but when I called out that we were English, and pointed to the English ensign, they gave a shout of joy, and we saw them running off to bring bananas for sale.’ The bearing of these statements upon the African Question needs not be noted. It shows that the reappearance of slave-trading agents has at once affected the relations of the Portuguese and the natives in the most injurious manner; and unless the Cabinet of Lisbon takes energetic and effectual steps to crush this evil, the authority of the Crown of Portugal on the river is at an end. Its mouths cannot be held by a slave-trading power.

to be understood and relished? If they never had any migratory tendencies, while their attachment to home is eminently strong; if they have no ideas of foreign countries, no knowledge of wages, no desire of accumulation of money; but, on the contrary, fresh hopes and rising desires at home, what a senseless project, or shameless hypocrisy, is that of calling them free labourers, disposing of themselves by contract to go they know not whither, for objects they cannot understand, and with persons whom they regard as slave-traders! This is the scheme which Count Walewski tells the American Minister, and the American Minister tells Congress, that England does not object to, and whence the American newspapers infer that the English people and their Government have changed their minds about the freedom of the negro races—fresh evidence being derived from a capricious journal or two, supposed to represent public opinion in England. England must afford a practical contradiction, emphatic and speedy; and there need be no doubt that such journals will speak loudest, as soon as the good old principles of justice, honour, and humanity are found to be more popular than the worn-out barbarisms and fallacies which cynics and ‘The London Cotton Plant’ have been trying to pass upon us as new and wise.

There are whole classes of commodities in Africa which have scarcely been heard of yet. The Portuguese in certain settlements have sent nearly 1000 miles for lime; and now it turns out that there were several varieties of marble within 100 miles of them. There is coal in some parts; and in Angola, veins have been found, whence the natives have obtained fine copper, and dug out malachite of splendid quality. These ores are now brought to market by a British association to which the King of Portugal has granted the working of the mines, on well secured conditions that no slave labour shall be employed, and that the wages given shall be fair. The rich and abundant produce transmitted to England in a few weeks, before any machinery was sent out, left no doubt of the prospects of the adventurers; and when the road to the coast is finished, no slave-trader need ever pry into that region again. The natives are ready and willing to work; and there can be no doubt of the nearest coast down to Ambriz and Loanda becoming a great centre of trade. Thus far, some natural wealth has been discovered wherever the natives are living; and if a returning wave of barbarism (European and American) does not sweep over the African continent, leaving that blossoming world desolate, the whole human race will be the better for the laying open of a new continent to civilisation and the bringing up of

whole races to a capacity for industry and general commercial intercourse.

It is the business of all the parties to anti-slave-trade treaties to see to this. England has the further duty of taking care that all the parties are faithful to their pledges. We can rely on Portugal for faithful companionship in the work before us. We can rely on every Power which has extinguished slavery in its own dominions, with the temporary exception of France. If we could obtain the ear of the people of France, all would be well; for a nation which has abolished colonial slavery, as the French did, will certainly refuse to perpetuate the curse under false pretences, as their government is doing at this moment. While unable, through the coercion of the French press, to reach the national mind, we must enforce existing treaties with the same vigour and resolution which our fathers put forth to obtain them.

There remain the Americans. Never were we and they more bound to each other in a common duty and a common sentiment than now. When we speak of the American people, we are thinking, first, of the sons and daughters of the founders of the Republic, and next of European immigrants who have entered the Republic as sons by adoption. For the moment, we put out of view the turbulent classes which have sprung from the one great corruption of the American polity, and which would be cowed at once by the mere reappearance of the old spirit which raised a group of colonies into a great nation. To the small band of retrograde slaveholders, and the smaller group of buccaneering guards of slavery, we have nothing to say here. We are thinking of the free millions who regard labour and social organisation in the light of the century in which they live; and human liberties with the love which their great men of a past century bequeathed to them. Will they not agree with us that they and we are standing at a critical point of time, when progress or retrogression, honour or disgrace, is before them and us; — before them as republicans by choice, and before us both as members of the league of Christendom? This is their profession in greeting us for the first time through the electric cable which brings us within speaking distance; and the opportunity and this use of it are alike critical.

They know, and we know, that the decision of this great question rests with ourselves and them. We do not intend to yield it. Cost what it may, England will extinguish the slave-trade, because any yielding of so clear and determinate a policy would cost yet more: but a full, free, cordial companionship in the effort on the part of the United States would save a world

of guilt and woe. The citizens can do it if they will. The existence of slavery in their nation is their misery and their shame. It has lowered their reputation, degraded their national character, barred their progress, vitiated their foreign policy, poisoned their domestic peace, divided their hearts and minds; and may ultimately explode their Union. The train has long been laid, and the match is applied: there is probably no escape from the catastrophe: but a vigorous and instant effort may yet avail. If not, there remains a broad future in which to build up a better polity. In any case, the citizens have it now in their power to save the world from a revival of the slave-trade, by abjuring slavery as a national institution. An ignorant and perverse minority may choose to cherish the curse within their own small frontier; but they cannot revive the trade, and must soon adopt free labour in self-defence. The opportunity of regenerating the Republic, and regaining the old place of honour among nations, is now present and pressing. If our American kindred accept and use it, in cordial alliance with England, their best days are yet to come. If they let it pass, the world will grieve, but the work will not the less be done. It is the 'manifest destiny' of justice and humanity to lead the world onward; and no retrograde ignorance, no sordid self-interest, no guile, however audacious or refined, can prevail against them.

ART. X.—*The Edinburgh Review and Mr. Froude's History.*
(Fraser's Magazine, Sept. 1858.)

MR. FROUDE having formally replied, in his own person, to our remarks on his 'History,' we shall, on this occasion, depart from our ordinary practice, and say a few words, though necessarily within very compressed limits, by way of rejoinder.

Mr. Froude now explains how difficulties had arisen in his mind as to the popular theory of the reign of Henry VIII., for which his study of the Statute Book furnished a solution. In his 'History' (iv. p. 533.) he protested that he had brought with him to the examination of the records the inherited impression, from which he had neither any thought nor any expectation that he should be disabused; but that he found that it melted between his hands. We beg he will compare the two passages together. The main 'difficulty' he seems to have felt is that of believing that able politicians can have been unscrupulous men. He again asserts that his 'History' is, 'in strict truth, a palimpsest.' We must again assert that, wholly drawn as his version of the acts of Henry's government is from documents framed by or under the direct influence of that government, to the

exclusion, on one pretence or another, of every other kind of evidence—widely removed as it is from impartiality—it is yet as widely removed from the version given by the government itself. Did the indictment against More demand at his hands the blood of all the Protestant martyrs from the time of Raymond of Toulouse? Was Cromwell attainted as a man of genius too much in advance of his age? Were the amnestied rebels of the North put to death as men who 'had lost their way in the world, and were unable or unwilling to find it?' Was the execution of Fisher and More defended to Europe on the grounds that 'they were obstacles to the free thought that was bursting from the soil,' and that 'when nations are in the throes of revolution, wild spirits are abroad on the storm?' Did the king, in negotiating for a reunion with Rome, ever utter anything like 'Undo the Reformation! Never?' Did he, in hiring assassins to take off Cardinal Beton, profess to be 'looking at things as they were, and not through conventional forms,' when he himself said that he did not wish to be seen in the matter? Are all these passages, and a thousand more like them, faithful 'readings off' of ancient authorities, however partially selected, or the figments of a most modern sophistry, the mixed offspring of Newman and Carlyle? The statesmen of those times professed, at all events, to be guided in their actions by justice, truth, good faith, and honour. If their feet were swift to shed innocent blood, they did not call it innocent, and say that to shed it was highly convenient to the State. As to the accordance between the Statutes and the State Papers, which Mr. Froude challenges us to dispute, we really are not surprised to find it complete, considering that both sets of documents were framed by the same persons and in the same interest.

Mr. Froude, in proceeding to answer our objections and criticisms in detail, has done us the favour to 'introduce some kind of arrangement into them.' In doing so, he has allowed to escape not only nineteen-twentieths of the broad objections taken to his views and assertions, but some questions (such as those raised at pp. 222. 232. of the 'Review'), which it touches his character as a historian in the highest degree to answer. The space which the answers might have occupied is filled with very general matter; with irrelevant, though not unskilful, attempts to engage sympathy for the advocate of 'so eminently unpopular a cause' as that of Protestantism against the Pope and the Roman Catholics; with long hypothetical cases and remarks upon our Indian empire; and with descriptions of certain persons, whose moral defects render them not apt recipients of his system of historical belief, the facts of which he wishes not to be sifted by controversy in detail, but rather taken together as a whole. Mr. Froude allows that there must have been great guilt somewhere. We do not see why it is more malignant to lay the guilt on Henry and his satellites than on their victims; why it is a greater slander on human nature to accuse Henry of uxoricide, than his wife of redoubled harlotry and aggravated incest. Nor do we see why our English feelings should lead us to maintain that the English life of that day was heroic, and that the English life of this day is so vile, as

to be actually founded on 'basenesses.' Nobody has represented Henry as a 'devil;' unless it be they who have made him commit all his cruelties and brutalities, not from passion and temptation, but with a cool head. We will venture to say there is not in any historian more of 'instinctive clutching' at the evil side of a character, or a more disagreeable study in human nature, than Mr. Froude's account of Anne Boleyn. But to come to the points Mr. Froude does take.

1. That the Statutes were really more familiar to previous writers than Mr. Froude thought, we will prove by one instance. His great original theory respecting the complaints in the Statutes of the decay of towns, was given by Hume and combated by Eden (*State of the Poor*, vol. i. p. 109.).

2. The Statutes of Labourers. Mr. Froude lets go by default the main charge: that of completely inverting the expressed object of the Statutes, and representing them as passed by a paternal government in the interest of the labourer, when they are clearly and professedly passed in the interest of the employer. We divine, however, from the singular expression, 'the high rate *at which* wages were *limited* by statute,' that he is now aware of the real state of the case. As to his over-estimate of the labourers' wages under the Statutes, our words, 'considerably more than the rent of a farm on which six labourers were kept, and a quarter of the income of a justice of the peace, as stated respectively in Mr. Froude's own pages,' are not very adequately summed up in 'a conclusion which the Reviewer considers preposterous.' On reperusing the Statute, we see no reason to doubt that we may fairly argue from the condition of the 'common servant in husbandry' (this, not 'farm servant,' at which Mr. Froude seems rather to catch, is the exact term) who was hired by the year, to that of the common labourer who was hired by the day. We have expressly accounted for the yearly servant's allowance of food, for which no sum is prescribed by the Statute, though in the case of the day labourer twopence was deducted from the wages when the master supplied food. The maximum addition per day for harvest work was fixed, but the total amount of additional wages obtained for harvest work must, from the nature of the case, have been a variable and conjectural item in the year's account; and it is so given by Mr. Froude, who, by the way, does not notice the paternal statute on this subject to which we referred him. But the comparison between the yearly and daily rate of hiring is only one way, among others, of showing the inadmissibility of an estimate which gives the commonest unskilled labourer regular wages by Statute (which of course was lower than the market rate,) equivalent in money of our time to upwards of fifty pounds a year.

3. Nobody has denied that the labourer's wages were rising at this period. What is denied is, that their rise was due to feudal laws passed to keep them down. If this will even 'admit of discussion,' Mr. Froude's dissertation must be rewritten to make it true. In the same way, nobody has denied that Tudor society had its good and hopeful features. The only question is, whether the good and hopeful features were foolish and oppressive feudal legislation,

noxious monopolies, butcherly vagrant Acts, arbitrary government, and barbarous penal laws.

4. To cover what we must call his extraordinary error, as to the ground of the king's demand for a divorce, Mr. Froude now explains his meaning to have been, that the first demand was not for a divorce, but for a dispensation for bigamy; and that it was only on the Pope's refusing to license bigamy that the King was driven to the theological and canonical ground on which, as we have shown, the demand for a divorce was necessarily based. For proof of this, we are referred to 'the more obvious sources' in the second volume of the 'State Papers.' We should have thought the *most* obvious source for Mr. Froude's theory of this cardinal question, was Mr. Froude's own history. 'It would have been far better if the legal labyrinth had never been entered, and if the divorce had been claimed only *on those considerations of policy for which it had been first demanded*,' and which formed the true justification of it.' When Mr. Froude (i. p. 267.) wrote thus, was he aware that a divorce could not be claimed on political considerations, and did he mean us to understand that he wished they had never demanded a divorce at all, but stuck to the demand for a dispensation for bigamy on political grounds? This part of the work will require to be recast in order to place the subject in its true light.

5. Mr. Froude now says that Cavendish's story is 'not true.' Before (Hist. i. 166.) he said that the story 'was not without its difficulties' (the same he now gives), but that 'at the same time we cannot suppose Cavendish to have invented so circumstantial a narrative,' and he proceeded immediately to ground on it an insinuation against Anne Boleyn. The main question, however, is, not whether the story is true, but why Mr. Froude said nothing of the bearing of this story on the origin of the King's desire for a divorce, and why, in his version of it, he omitted the names of the King and Wolsey, and said, that 'if Cavendish's account be true, the affair was ultimately interrupted by Lord Northumberland himself,' when Cavendish's account is, that Lord Northumberland interposed only at the instance of Wolsey, who spoke in the name of the King.

6. With regard to the bearing of the suspicious clauses in the Second Act of Succession, on the grounds of the King's divorce from Anne Boleyn, and the disputed point of his intrigue with her sister — the question is, how came the ostensibly general clauses into the special Act; and if there is a clear special application in the case of the exactly parallel clauses in the first Act of Succession, is it not to be presumed that there is a special application in the case of the second Act also? Till this question is met, it is needless to go further; and it is scarcely approached in Mr. Froude's reply. The supposition that the country was full of confusion and litigation for want of an enactment respecting marriages doubtful on the ground of consanguinity by illicit intercourse, is advanced without proof; and, if this was the case, why should the Legislature have delayed the requisite enactment so long, and then thrust it into the special Act confirming the divorce of the King from Anne Boleyn? It is not

very candid to transfer⁶ to the foreground of our argument the extract of a letter from Henry to Anne Boleyn, on which we did not rely, and which we gave for no more than it may be worth. It shows that Mary Boleyn was the subject of a mysterious allusion in correspondence between the King and her sister. Mr. Froude 'does not suspect us,'—that is, he rather wishes we should be suspected,—of intentionally omitting in transcription a redundant pronoun, which, if anything, points the passage more clearly to our mark. He will see, by reference to p. 223. of the Review, that we knew the date of the correspondence. Let us now ask him why he has withheld from his readers the existence of these letters, one of which, he must be aware, throws a glaring light on the character and motives of the King?

7. The question is not whether Henry was more or less of a persecutor, but why Mr. Froude throws the blame of persecution exclusively on More and the Bishops, and keeps the King, who, at that time, at all events, was the great persecutor, entirely out of sight. That Henry was a persecutor to the last, the case of Lambert, whom he tried in person, and himself sent to the stake, abundantly proves. Mr. Froude has ignored the principal passage (that on the execution of John Rouse), in reference to which we charged him with coquetting with persecution.

8. Mr. Froude 'had no desire to accuse More:' not when he gratuitously connected More's name, by a rhetorical artifice, with the murder of Archbishop Allen. If he has the means of 'drawing a far 'darker indictment,' let him do so, in the name of truth. But to be very dark, it must include graver counts than that of 'calumniating 'Bayfield,' and being Chancellor when the writ was taken out of Chancery by the Bishop of Norwich for the execution of Bilney. The outburst of More's spleen against heretics, which Mr. Froude quotes so triumphantly, is balanced by expressions of an opposite kind, and it certainly bore no very bloody meaning to Erasmus, to whom it was addressed, for Erasmus afterwards (Ep. 426.) mentions it as a proof of More's great gentleness of heart, that 'while he was 'Chancellor no heretic suffered death.' This statement Mr. Froude quotes with contempt from *More's Life of More*, which shows that he has not read Erasmus's letters on the subject. We are not 'champions 'of persecutors,' because we think fit to sift the evidence adduced to prove that Sir Thomas More was guilty of great cruelties and gross breaches of law.

9. The case of Philips. If we 'followed' any one 'into an error,' in saying that the secular magistrate could not liberate a prisoner under sentence of excommunication, we followed writers who are more explicit on the subject than Mr. Froude. Mr. Froude is explicit now, however; and it appears, on his own showing, that he not very candidly charged More with being privy to the prolonged imprisonment of Philips, fully believing, but not stating, that More had no legal power to prevent it.

10. The case of John Field. We have only to repeat that the

illegal imprisonment by More rests on the same *ex parte* evidence (Mr. Froude himself allowed it to be *ex parte*), as the rest of the case.

11. The case of Bilney. Mr. Froude says, 'since in Bilney's persecution I made no mention of More, I need not refer to it.' He however placed Bilney's case third in a series of four which he brought in form against Sir Thomas More, and said in introducing it, 'With Wolsey heresy was an error—with More it was a crime. No sooner had the seals changed hands than the Smithfield fires recommenced; and, encouraged by the Chancellor, the bishops resolved to obliterate in these edifying spectacles the recollection of their general infirmities.'

12. Bainham's case. Mr. Froude places among the acts of persecution, not denied by More, the whipping of Bainham in More's house at Chelsea, which More had distinctly denied. He now suggests that though not done by More, or with his knowledge, it may have been done by his servants, 'improving upon the pattern' of 'brutality' set them by their master. These 'servants' should have appeared in the history.

13. We pointed out Mr. Froude's widely different estimate of Foxe as a witness in the case of More, and in the case of Anne Boleyn. He replies that he 'trusts Foxe when he produces documentary evidence.' What documentary evidence does Foxe produce of More's having racked Bainham in the Tower, which is brought forward in this very passage as a certain fact, and as presumptive evidence of further guilt?

14. The speech of Bainham, designating More as his accuser and his judge, is not given in the edition of Foxe of 1684, to which (vol. ii. pp. 249. 277.) we referred. But it is given, as cited by Mr. Froude, in Cattley's edition; and our charge of inaccuracy is, of course, at once withdrawn. It would have been avoided if Mr. Froude had set out the editions of authors cited by him at the commencement of his book. It is preposterous to say that Cattley's edition of Foxe is the only one entitled to be cited as an authority. And why, in the only place (we believe) in which Mr. Froude refers to it by name, does he call it, not 'Cattley's,' but 'Townsend's'?

15. 'I have falsified, it seems, Sir Thomas More's trial, by concealing the perjury of the Solicitor-General Rich, &c.' The ' &c.' in these words of Mr. Froude, comprehends a good deal, as will be found on comparing his account with the accounts of More and Rich given in the fifth volume of the careful and learned work of Mr. Foss. Mr. Froude, however, now says that the account of Rich's evidence given by the 'history books,' is a fable, because it appears by the indictment that More was not charged with the treasonable words said to have been sworn to against him by Rich, but only with evading the test. In his history (vol. ii. p. 377.), he concludes the list of charges against More with, 'Finally, and chiefly, he had spoken treasonable words in the Tower to Rich, the Solicitor-General.' He then proceeds to give, though in a very softened form, the common

account of Rich's practising on More in the Tower, and of the evidence thereby obtained; after which, he sums up with, 'This was 'the substance of the indictment.'

16. The historian can hardly be warranted in dispensing with the evidence of a fair trial in the case of Cromwell, because the reviewer rejects the evidence of what he maintains to have been an unfair trial in the case of Anne Boleyn.

17. We still think Mr. Froude's language respecting the evidence against Surréy loose in the extreme, especially if all is given that we gave in the review. And we still think it no part of the duty of a historian to be stopping the gaps in a government indictment with speculative political consequences which were not in the mind of the Government themselves.

18. But for Mr. Froude's 'arrangement' of our criticisms, it would appear that in our words 'they (the Parliament) impeached Wolsey, ['among other things, for checking the persecution of Lutherans at 'Cambridge,'] no very material inaccuracy is involved. The point of the sentence is that which Mr. Froude omits, viz., that checking the persecution of Lutherans was one of the articles of impeachment in a Parliament which Mr. Froude represents as Protestant.

19. To prove that the debasement of the currency in 1546 was occasioned by a temporary loan from the Mint, and was 'a proceeding not distinguishable, except in form, from the suspension of specie 'payments in 1797,' Mr. Froude cites two letters of Lord Chancellor Wriothesley (State Papers, vol. i. pp. 835. 839.). Wriothesley speaks of a loan, among other sources, from the Mint, that is, practically from those who brought bullion to the Mint; but we do not see that he says any thing to connect this with the debasement of the currency, much less to identify either proceeding in principle with the suspension of cash payments to stop a panic run on the Bank in 1797.

20. If Mr. Froude thinks it impossible that the Earl of Wiltshire can have done so unnatural a thing as to take part in the proceedings which led to the condemnation of his own children under the influence of terrorism, he should read the history of other reigns of terror.

21. Mr. Froude may, or may not, be able (we think he is not able) to reach the effect of Constantyne's statements as to the extortion of Smeton's confession by racking, and the 'much muttering' of the people at the Queen's trial; but these important statements should not have been, the first suppressed, the second either suppressed, or thrust down into a note and there strangely disguised and perverted. We did observe—we were not called upon to repeat—the quotation which Mr. Froude does give from Constantyne. Mr. Froude's quotation is 'in a manner *all confessed* but Mr. Norris, who said almost 'nothing at all.' Constantyne's Memorial (in the form of a dialogue) runs, '*D. How died the others? G. Many in a manner confessed all 'but Mr. Norice, who said almost nothing at all.' 'The others'—that is, excepting Brereton, who, by Constantyne's account, did not confess, but 'died worst of all.' If Mr. Froude would give the confessions, it would be seen that it is 'in a manner' indeed.*

•22. 'She (Jane Seymour) married the King under circumstances 'peculiarly agitating, without preparation, without attachment, either 'on her part or on his, but under the pressure of a sudden and tragical necessity.' By these, to us astonishing words, Mr. Froude now says he meant that the genuineness of the letter in which Anne Boleyn taxes her husband with an attachment to another woman, is very doubtful, and that even if it is genuine, there is nothing to show that the woman meant was Jane Seymour; and he easily leaps from our *not knowing there was* an attachment to our *knowing there was not*. Before (*Hist.* ii. p. 477.) he said 'this letter, *which I cannot doubt to be authentic, is most affecting*;' and (p. 460.) 'she (Anne Boleyn) affected herself to be jealous of her husband's attentions to *Jane Seymour*.'

23. We cannot go again over the case of Anne Boleyn. If Mr. Froude 'can discover no legitimate ground for doubting her guilt,' he ought as a historian to state this plainly in face of the evidence, not slip it in by inuendo a volume off. We may leave it to the acuteness of the propounder to answer the new question, why the Catholic insurgents of the North and the Catholic party abroad did not complain of the unjust execution of the Protestant Queen. Meteren himself may be 'half a century later,' but the evidence he embodies is contemporary.

24. We asked Mr. Froude, in reference to the trials of the alleged accomplices of Anne Boleyn, whether in the whole course of the reign a judge and jury once acquitted the victim of a crown prosecution. He cites the cases of Lord Dacres of the North, and the Yorkshire insurgent Levening; and on the strength of those two instances proceeds to charge us with 'rapid statements abounding in every 'page,' and writing which is 'worse then indefensible.' Lord Dacres of the North was tried, as Mr. Froude himself says, not by a judge and jury, but by the Peers. Levening was not tried at all. The bill against him was thrown out by the grand jury at York; and Mr. Froude (*Hist.* iii. p. 213.) expressly attributes the conduct of the grand jurymen not to integrity and independence, but to corrupt family influence and complicity with the accused.

25. Our limits compel us to decline another discussion on the Test of Supremacy. We can only say we are sorry for it if Mr. Froude cannot see the difference between shooting mutineers or rebels, and putting to death virtuous men, guilty of no act of treason or even of disloyalty, for refusing to take a test of opinion, the exact contrary of what the imponent himself had been vehemently maintaining a few years before.

We were in no haste to criticise Mr. Froude. We suspended our judgment till this portion of his work was complete; and we should have been well content if the task of thorough examination had been undertaken by other hands. We have used no 'personal' taunts, if by 'personal' is meant anything not fairly before us as literary critics. We have paid, and beg again to pay, the tribute of just praise to the beauty of his style and to the interesting character of many parts of his work—an interest in the production of which,

however, those who have laboured to prepare him new materials from our public archives and records, must of course claim a considerable share. We should sincerely regret to have done him the slightest injustice, either through error or through the indignation which he must know that certain passages of his book, if they fail to fascinate, cannot fail to excite. But we feel assured, that our main case against him is just; and that in bringing it forward as forcibly as we could, we have done no more than our duty, and the effect which the undoubted literary qualities of his book had produced, as well as the indiscriminate panegyrics which had been lavished upon it, imperatively required at our hands.

INDEX

- Aberdeen*, Earl of, successful issue of the great struggle of 1813 largely influenced by, 67.
- Addington*, Mr., satirical effusions of, 128, *et seq.*
- Anti-Jacobin*, Poetry of the, with notes, by Charles Esmond, reviewed, 104.
- Army*, review of works relating to the health of the, 136, *et seq.*—rates of mortality in civil life and in the army compared, 141—causes of the mortality in the Guards, 143, *et seq.*—in the Infantry, 160, *et seq.*
- Astronomy*, spirit and progress of, 96, *et seq.*

B

- Beranger*, Posthumous Memoirs and Songs of, reviewed, 175, *et seq.*—his personal appearance, 177—estimate of his genius, 179—his early life, 180, *et seq.*—character of his songs, 188—of his letters, 190—his benevolence, 192—his friendship with Judith Frère, 193.
- Bernadotte*, motive of his conduct in the campaign of 1813, 47.
- Binocular vision*, works on, reviewed, 437, *et seq.*—stereoscope invented by Professor Wheatstone, 438, 453—inquiry into the nature of monocular vision, 439, *et seq.*—inquiry into the nature of binocular vision, 450, *et seq.*
- Birch*, Samuel, his History of Ancient Pottery, reviewed, 377, *et seq.*
- Buckingham*, Duke of, his Memoirs of the Court of England during the Regency, reviewed, 299, *et seq.*

C

- Canning*, George, his literary remains, 104, *et seq.*—the first eminent Tory after Pitt who embraced the doctrines of Free Trade, 104—his essays in 'The Microcosm,' 107—in 'The Anti-Jacobin,' 110—Niebuhr's exaggerated censure of, 124—his contributions to the 'Quarterly Review,' 131—influence of his literary taste upon his oratory, 135.
- Celts and Germans*, review of works on the ethnographical relations of, 166, *et seq.*—Holtzmann's views, 172, *et seq.*—confuted by Brandes, 174.
- Criminal Procedure* in Scotland and England, 343, *et seq.*—case of Madeline Smith, 344, *et seq.*—preliminary steps under the Scotch system, 347, *et seq.*—public prosecutor, 352—mode of examination,

356, *et seq.*—copy of indictment and list of witnesses furnished to prisoner, 363—‘running letters’ explained, 367—indictment, 368—conduct of trial, 369—application of the law of evidence, 370—verdict, 372, *et seq.*—unanimity of the jury, 375.

F

Faraday, Professor, on the Conservation of Force, 71.

Froude, J. A., his *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth*, reviewed, 206, *et seq.*—his style, 207—his defective political reasoning, 209—his erroneous notions of political economy, 211—his view of the Statutes of Laborers, 215—of the divorce of Catherine of Aragon, 219, *et seq.*—of Henry’s connexion with Mary Boleyn, 221, *et seq.*—of the fall of Wolsey, 230—of the Parliament of 1530, 231, *et seq.*—of the boiling of Rouse, 234—of the execution of Aker, More, and Haughton, 236, *et seq.*—of the case of Anne Boleyn, 246—his defence of the crimes of Henry, 249, *et seq.*—his misstatements regarding the Geraldines, 485, note—his reply to the Edinburgh Review, 586, *et seq.*

G

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., his *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*, reviewed, 502, *et seq.*—state of the Homeric question in England, 503—line of argument adopted by Mr. Gladstone, 504—applied to Shakspeare, 506—topography, 510, *et seq.*—Scylla and Charybdis, 520, note—Scheria, 521—Thrinacia, 523—Ogygia, 524—natural religion, 527—ethics, 528, *et seq.*

Grenville Administration, its composition, 301—cause of its failure, 306.

Grey, Earl, his *Parliamentary Government considered with reference to a Reform of Parliament*, reviewed, 271, *et seq.*

Grove, W. R., his work on the Correlation of Physical Forces, 80.

Guizot, M., his *Memoirs to illustrate the History of my Time*, review of, 408, *et seq.*—his early life, 413—his character, 414—vicissitudes of the constitutional monarchy, 416—employed under Louis XVIII., 419—the Hundred Days, 420, *et seq.*—his interview with Louis at Ghent, 422—origin of the *Doctrinaires*, 425—cause of their failure, 425, *et seq.*—his character of M. de Villèle, 432—his lectures on Modern History, 432, *et seq.*—character and conduct of Charles X., 435, *et seq.*

Guy Livingstone, or *Thorough*, a novel, review of, 552, *et seq.*

H

Hindû drama, its character, 256, *et seq.*—exemplified in the *Sakountalâ* of Kâlidâsa, 257, *et seq.*

Holtzmann, Adolf von, his *Kelten und Germanen*, reviewed, 166, *et seq.*

K

Kildare, Marquis of, his *Facts of Kildare and their Ancestors*, from 1057 to 1773; reviewed, 474, *et seq.*—position of the Norman

- aristocracy in Ireland, and its results, 475, 476—origin of the Geraldines, 477—the eighth earl espouses the cause of Simnel, 480—policy of Henry VIII. towards the Geraldines, 482—its failure, 483—their destruction resolved on, 484—their execution, and the attainder of the *reges*; 485—subsequent restoration and loyalty, 486, *et seq.*—adventures of the eleventh earl, 487, *et seq.*—religious wars, 490, *et seq.*—effects of the Revolution, 493—the Irish Brigade, 495—the Irish Whigs, 496, *et seq.*—popularity of the Earl of Kildare, 498—created DuRe of Leinster, 499—his patriotism, 500.

Liberia, character of that colony, 550.

Liverpool Administration, negotiations for its formation, 336, *et seq.*—its popularity overthrown by the Queen's trial, 342.

London Cotton Plant, a slave-trade, *et seq.* reviewed, 541.

M

Metternich, M. de, his interview with Napoleon at Dresden, 49—his character, 51.

Miller, Hugh, review of his works, 1, *et seq.*—his birth and early life, 2—his first literary attempts, 3—character of his controversial writings, 5—his mental endowments, 6—his geological works, 9, *et seq.*—his philosophical and religious views, 21, *et seq.*

N

Napoleon I., impolicy of his Continental system, 33, *et seq.*—incidents connected with his marriage with Josephine, 40—interview with Metternich at Dresden, 50—battle of Dresden, 58—compared with Wellington, 68—his conduct during the Hundred Days, 420.

Nightingale, Miss, her exposure of the sanitary failures of the British military system, 154.

P

Parliamentary Government, the permanent object of Parliamentary Reform, 271, *et seq.*—its essence as understood in this country, 278—effect of the separation of the executive and legislative powers in the United States, 283—effects of the abuse of patronage, 293, *et seq.*

Perceval Administration, its composition, 324—continued by the Prince Regent, 330—its dissolution, 336.

Physical Science, review of works on the progress and spirit of, 71.

Portland Administration, its composition, 309—Perceval, 310—Canning, 311—Castlereagh, *ibid.*—Duel between Canning and Castlereagh, 322—its dissolution, 323.

Powell, Baden, *Essays on the Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, the Unity of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation*, by, reviewed, 75.

S

Slave Trade in 1858, works on, reviewed, 541, *et seq.*—its disguised revival by the French government, 541. 580—arguments of its abettors, 542, *et seq.*—duty of its enemies, 545—influence of slavery on the political and social condition of the United States, 547, *et seq.*—slavery in America under the English rule and at present contrasted, 548—Liberia, 550—scheme of the slave-holders, 552—M. Cresson, 551, *et seq.*—Mr. Clay's duplicity, 554—present position of free negroes in the States, 555—site and climate of Liberia, 556—a nest of slave-dealers, 557—condition of the immigrants, 558, *et seq.*—case of the *Regina Coeli*, 560, *et seq.*—French method of supplying negro labour, 563—American legislation in connexion with slavery, *et seq.*—Texas, 565—Dred Scott of the South, 568—the slave question in Virginia, 570—disastrous effects of slavery on the republic, 572—Cuba, 575, *et seq.*—present state of Africa, 581, *et seq.*—African wealth, 584, *et seq.*—extinction of the Slave-trade ceremony, 584, *et seq.*—

Stereoscope invented by Professor Wheatstone, 438. 453.

T

Teutonic Knights, *Chronicles of the*, reviewed, 197, *et seq.*

Thiers, M., review of his *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*, continued, 32, *et seq.*—state of Europe in 1809, 32—the Continental System, 34, *et seq.*—his account of Josephine's divorce, 40—campaign of 1813, 42—battle of Lutzen, 43—Napoleon's conduct during the armistice of, 47, *et seq.*—battle of Dresden, 57—battle of Culm, 60—battles of Katzbach, Grossbeeren, and Dennewitz, 62—movements previous to the battle of Leipsic, 64, *et seq.*—his unfairness towards England, 67—comparison between Napoleon and Wellington. 68—his misstatements of fact and his false reasoning, 69—the work a contradiction of his public conduct, 70.

W

Wheatstone, C., his *Contributions to the Physiology of Vision* reviewed, 437, *et seq.*—the inventor of the stereoscope, 438. 453, *et seq.*

Williams, M., his *Sakoontalá, or the Lost Ring*, review of, 253, *et seq.*

END OF VOL. CVIII.

